


UC-NRLF



8 3 927 989



LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

RECEIVED BY EXCHANGE

Class

THE REVIVAL
OF SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY

THE REVIVAL
OF SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY
IN THE
NINETEENTH CENTURY

BY
JOSEPH LOUIS PERRIER, PH.D.

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, IN THE FACULTY
OF PHILOSOPHY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK

1909

Copyright, 1909
BY THE COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
Printed from type March, 1909

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA

PREFACE

The present work consists of two parts, the first of which may be described as definitional; the second, as historical.

The first part (Chapters I to VIII) is not intended to be a complete course of Scholastic philosophy. I limit myself to an exposition and a discussion of those principles of Scholasticism, a knowledge of which is indispensable to an understanding of the Scholastic revival. For an adequate knowledge of Scholastic philosophy, I would refer my readers to the masterly expositions of Urráburu, Mercier, and the Jesuits of Stonyhurst. The shorter treatises of Ginebra and Pécsi are also excellent.

In the historical part, I have divided the speculative world into races rather than into political divisions. I have thus included German Austria in the chapter on Germany and devoted a separate section to Hungary. I have likewise studied South American republics in connection with the neo-Scholastic movement in Spain. It is into races, rather than into arbitrary tracts of land, that the world is divided. In spite of the ridiculous principle we call the Monroe doctrine, South American nations are and will always be essentially Spanish. With Spain they speak, they think and they pray. They regard us as strangers, sometimes as barbarians. They emphatically refuse to accept the protection we would force upon them.

In completing this second part, I have derived considerable help from the following works:

Gonzalez's *Historia de la Filosofía*,

Blanc's *Histoire de la Philosophie et particulièrement de la Philosophie contemporaine*,

Besse's *Deux centres du mouvement thomiste*,

Gomez Izquierdo's *Historia de la Filosofía del siglo XIX*,

Ferreira-Deusdado's *La Philosophie thomiste en Portugal*,
van Becelaere's *La Philosophie en Amérique*,
Garcia's *Tomismo y Neotomismo*,
Valverde Tellez's historical works.

I tender my sincere thanks to the friends who have assisted me in the preparation of this book. In particular, I acknowledge my obligation to Professor John Dewey, of Columbia University.

NEW YORK, April, 1908.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	
CHAPTER I	
WHAT IS SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY?	
SECT. 1: Scholastic Philosophy	14
SECT. 2: Neo-Scholastic Philosophy	34
CHAPTER II	
SCHOLASTIC LOGIC	41
CHAPTER III	
SCHOLASTIC METAPHYSICS	
SECT. 1: Existence of Metaphysics	46
SECT. 2: Scholastic Theory of Act and Potency	49
SECT. 3: Scholastic Theory of Substance	52
SECT. 4: Scholastic Theory of Cause	68
CHAPTER IV	
SCHOLASTIC COSMOLOGY	
SECT. 1: Chief Hypotheses as to the Constitution of Matter	82
SECT. 2: Nature and Properties of Primordial Matter	86
SECT. 3: Nature and Properties of the Substantial Form	95
SECT. 4: Modern Science and the Constitution of Matter	100
CHAPTER V	
SCHOLASTIC PSYCHOLOGY	
SECT. 1: Theory of Abstraction	110
SECT. 2: Nature of the Human Soul	115
SECT. 3: Locus of the Human Soul	121
CHAPTER VI	
SCHOLASTIC NATURAL THEOLOGY	
SECT. 1: Natural and Revealed Theology	126
SECT. 2: Proofs of God's Existence	127
SECT. 3: Attributes of God	131
CHAPTER VII	
SCHOLASTIC MORAL PHILOSOPHY	136
CHAPTER VIII	
FORERUNNERS OF THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL	153

CHAPTER IX

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN ITALY	158
---	-----

CHAPTER X

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN SPAIN, PORTUGAL AND
SPANISH AMERICA

SECT. 1: The Neo-Scholastic Revival in Spain	174
SECT. 2: The Neo-Scholastic Revival in Portugal	183
SECT. 3: The Neo-Scholastic Revival in Mexico	185
SECT. 4: The Neo-Scholastic Revival in South America	191

CHAPTER XI

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN GERMANY AND AUSTRIA	196
---	-----

CHAPTER XII

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN FRANCE	203
--	-----

CHAPTER XIII

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN BELGIUM	215
---	-----

CHAPTER XIV

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

SECT. 1: The Neo-Scholastic Revival in Hungary, Bohemia and the Netherlands	224
SECT. 2: The Neo-Scholastic Revival in England	228

CHAPTER XV

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN THE UNITED STATES
AND CANADA

SECT. 1: The Neo-Scholastic Revival in the United States	232
SECT. 2: The Neo-Scholastic Revival in Canada	244
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC LITERATURE ..	249

INTRODUCTION

One of the movements that have excited the interest of the world of thought in the nineteenth century has been the revival of Scholasticism. The philosophy of the Middle Ages had been, for centuries past, buried in deepest oblivion. It had been considered inconsistent with the development of natural science; and all, philosophers as well as scientists, deemed it dead—a most fitting end. It appeared to us, in the dim light of history, as an ill-shapen monster, which had wandered in the darkness of night, amid philters and mysterious juices, during the ages in which men seriously considered alchemy and the philosopher's stone. But the monster, thought we, had disappeared forever at the light of modern discoveries, like the ill-omened bird of night, which cannot abide the rays of the morning sun.

Suddenly, to the astonishment of all, Scholasticism has awaked from its slumber. It has appeared again in the face of the world, has been accepted by great minds, has been expounded and defended by powerful writers, and has given rise to a great number of interesting philosophical works. Its admirers have even tried, not only to prove its congruity with modern scientific results, but to show that it is the only system capable of explaining them.

As was to be expected, such a revival has met with the most severe criticism. Friedrich Paulsen, in the introduction to his work *Immanuel Kant*, comparing Scholasticism with the Kantian system, expresses himself thus:

“If Scholastic philosophy is at present experiencing a kind of revival in the school of Catholicism, this is due, not so much to its own inner vitality as to its supposed fitness to serve an ecclesiastical political system, which, through the favor of circumstances,—*patientia Dei et stultitia hominum*, an old Luth-

eran would say,—has attained again in our time to unexpected power. Moreover, there still remains the question whether continuance of existence is in general something of which a philosophy can boast. Perhaps fruitfulness is a better characteristic and this the Kantian philosophy shows; it still gives rise to new systems of thought. Thomism, on the contrary, though of course a great achievement for its own time, yields to-day nothing except unfruitful repetitions. It does not set free the spirit, it enslaves it, which of course is just its intention.”¹

In close connection with Paulsen’s view stands the thesis recently defended by Mr. Picavet in his famous *Esquisse d’une histoire générale et comparée des civilisations médiévales*. For him, Scholastic philosophy and the body of Christian dogmas are identical; the existence of God and the immortality of the soul are the essential Scholastic doctrines. Accordingly, he seems disposed to widen the field of Scholasticism, and to include within its limits a certain number of men whom neo-Scholastics will probably be loath to welcome as brethren. Not only does he admit Descartes and Locke,² but also Rousseau and Voltaire.³ He even feels inclined to add to his heterogeneous list the name of Robespierre.⁴ But the man to whom he directs our attention with the greatest insistence, whom he regards as a direct offspring of the Middle Ages, as a man “in the theological period still, a Christian, a Lutheran, a pietist, a Scholastic,” is Immanuel Kant.⁵

Why not? Kant quotes the Bible; he develops the proof of the existence of God from final causes, and he is fond of repeating the Hebrew meaning—God with us—of his name Immanuel.⁶ In religion, Kant is a supporter of the Christian doctrine; he advocates the existence of free-will; when he under-

¹ Immanuel Kant, p. 11.

² *Esquisse d’une histoire générale et comparée des civilisations médiévales*, p. 239.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 247.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 241.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 242.

takes his *Critique of Pure Reason*, he is morally certain of the existence of God and of another life.⁷ It is in Christian terms that he expresses the final conclusion he reaches, denouncing, as believers do, the insufficiency of speculative reason and ending with an act of faith.⁸ In one word, Kant's work is an apologetic and may be compared to St. Thomas's *Summa contra Gentiles*. "Son œuvre rappelle celle des apologistes, en particulier de saint Thomas qui, dans la Somme contre les Gentils, veut amener au catholicisme, avec le seul appui de la raison, les mahométans, les juifs, les hérétiques de toutes les nuances. De même Kant s'adresse aux athées et aux matérialistes, aux panthéistes et aux fatalistes, aux incrédules et aux esprits forts."⁹

The impulse given to neo-Thomism by Leo XIII is for Picavet as well as for Paulsen, primarily and essentially a political affair. In his survey of the progress of neo-Scholasticism in the different countries of Europe and in America, it is not a speculative, but a political point of view that is invariably taken. The acceptance of Thomistic speculation in Belgium is given as one of the causes of the political successes obtained by Catholics since 1884. The strength of the Catholic party in Germany is also insisted upon. In connection with the Thomistic revival, Picavet quotes the fact that Prince Bismarck was constrained to abandon the Kulturkampf, that the Catholic minority, giving toasts to the pope and to the emperor, becomes more powerful every day.¹⁰

Finally, à propos of neo-Scholasticism in the United States, Picavet limits himself to considerations about the growing political and social influence of Catholics in this country, and speaks of Bishop Ireland, and of the condemnation of the propositions known as Americanism and contained in the "Life of Father Hecker."

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 242.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 246.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 246.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 286.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 290-292.

In short, Picavet and Paulsen are unanimous in regarding Scholasticism as a religious and political affair; but, whereas Paulsen restricts the denotation of the word to Roman Catholicism, Picavet seems ready to enlarge its usual acceptation, so as to make it embrace all Christian denominations. Picavet, however, would probably distinguish between Protestant and Catholic Scholasticism, so that his views as to the revival of Thomism would closely resemble Paulsen's own views.

There are two points which both authors clearly distinguish and strongly insist upon:

1. The essential agreement of the Thomistic philosophical doctrine with the body of Catholic dogmas.
2. The political significance of the Scholastic revival.

We will presently examine each of these points separately.

With regard to the first, we may readily admit that there is a great deal of truth in the foregoing theories. That the immediate cause of the revival of Thomism is its real or apparent harmony with the body of theological doctrines of the Catholic Church, it would be vain to deny. The following considerations will dispel any doubt that might exist on this point:

1. The greater number of modern philosophical systems have been condemned by Catholic theologians as opposed to revealed truth, and many among the leaders of modern thought have seen their works placed on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. We find in the *Index* the names of Descartes, Malebranche, Locke, Condillae, Hume, Kant, Rosmini, etc.

2. The neo-Scholastic movement has been encouraged, since its very birth, by the visible head of the Catholic Church, Pope Leo XIII. In the encyclical *Inscrutabile Dei Consilio*, published in 1878, in the encyclical *Æterni Patris* (1879), in briefs relating to the foundation of the Roman Academy of St. Thomas and of the *Institut Supérieur de Philosophie* of Louvain, as well as in many other writings, Leo XIII has promoted the study of the great mediæval philosophers, and in particular of St. Thomas Aquinas.

3. As will be seen in the part of this work dealing with the history of neo-Scholasticism, all the great writers of this school belong to the Roman Catholic faith; most of them, in fact, are Catholic priests.

4. Moreover, St. Thomas Aquinas, who has always been regarded by Catholics as the greatest theologian, whose *Summa Theologica* is, and has always been, widely studied in ecclesiastical institutions, is the very philosopher to whom the new movement unanimously adheres. It is his doctrine that is expounded and commented upon in all neo-Scholastic treatises of philosophy. The two words Thomism and Scholasticism have become synonymous; periodicals founded to foster the revival of mediæval thought have been called *Divus Thomas* and *Revue Thomiste*; and, in countries in which neo-Scholasticism has been most flourishing, St. Thomas is considered as the patron saint of philosophers.

The element of truth we are actually considering ought not, however, to make us suppose that the Catholic faith and the Thomistic principles are necessarily bound together. The philosophy of Plato and St. Augustine has been the official philosophy of the Church for more than eight hundred years. And, at the appearance of St. Thomas's works, a strong current of opposition to his teaching arose within the Church, nay within his own order, and gave birth to Duns Scotus's philosophy, which differs so widely from Thomism that it has been said that there is not a single proposition in the works of the Angelic Doctor which has not been controverted by his subtle rival. And despite this fact, Scotists profess to be as decidedly orthodox as their opponents, and, quite recently, Secrétan has even gone so far as to defend the thesis that the philosophy of Duns Scotus is more in harmony with the spirit of Christianity than the traditional Thomistic philosophy.¹² This seems to be also the view of Mr. John Dewey.¹³

¹² Cf. Secrétan, *La Restauration du Thomisme*, *Revue Philosophique*, Vol. 18, p. 64 ff.

¹³ Cf. the article: *Belief and Realities*, *Philos. Rev.*, March, 1906.

In modern times, Catholic writers have repeatedly formulated systems of thought which can be harmonized without too much difficulty with Catholic dogmas. Descartes, Malebranche, Rosmini, Cousin, Lamennais, De Bonald, have had within the Church itself numerous and illustrious disciples. Cousin's eclecticism has been for many years the official philosophy of a great number of Catholic institutions. Finally, in our own day, despite the revival of Thomism and the encyclical of Leo XIII, many of the orthodox, many ecclesiastics, do not think it amiss to adhere to philosophical systems which, in their principles and in their methods, are widely divergent from the Thomistic doctrine. Suffice it to mention the adherence of so many members of the French clergy to the revival of Kantism, and the enthusiasm with which some eminent Catholics of the same country have welcomed the appearance of Pragmatism.

Passing now to the political significance of the Scholastic revival, we will certainly concede that all the beliefs of a nation have a more or less direct influence upon its political institutions. A nation is a great whole, a great social unit, whose spirit is gradually formed by the conjoint influence of all the elements at work among the race, is at the same time the effect and the cause of the educational system, of the philosophy, of the literature of the nation, of all and each one of the channels through which her very blood and life flows.

The political influence of the philosopher should not, however, be exaggerated. It is at once obvious that a man who pretends to rise above mediocrity in any special field must concentrate thereto the energies of his whole life. He who wants to become a great philosopher must not be anything else. A few neo-Scholastics have entered the political arena; but, in so doing, they have so little obeyed the spirit of neo-Scholasticism that their course of action has been deplored by the Scholastics themselves. A man who has been second to none in his perfect grasping of the intentions of Leo XIII, Cardinal Gonzalez,

expressed his sincere regret when Orti y Lara abandoned the field of philosophy to devote his talent to public affairs.¹⁴

The fitness of Scholasticism to serve the Catholic ecclesiastical political system, which—*patientia Dei et stultitia hominum*—Paulsen regards as the only cause of the revival of Mediaeval philosophy, cannot thus be its only cause, nor that which possesses the greatest significance in the history of human thought. Besides the fact that the Church can accommodate itself to all forms of government, and that there is therefore no Catholic ecclesiastical political system—as was pointed out by Mr. Domet de Vorges in answer to Picavet¹⁵—it must be borne in mind that Scholasticism is, above all, a philosophy and must be characterized as a philosophy.

The question of the cause of the neo-Scholastic revival leads at once to the remark that it is not always possible to find in the general conditions of any given period a definite and necessary cause for all the events which form its history. Historical facts are often connected with unimportant, even trivial occurrences, so that it sometimes seems to the thoughtful man that chance governs the world. Would Charles I have been executed if young Oliver Cromwell had not been prevented from embarking for America? Would our civil war have taken place if Henry Clay had defeated Polk in the elections of 1844? Would there have been a neo-Scholastic revival if Sanseverino had died when a young man and Leo XIII had not been elected to succeed Pius IX in the papal see? These are questions to which I would not dare give an answer.

The conditions of the possibility of an event must undoubtedly exist at the moment in which the event occurs; but there must also be found an occasional cause which may fail to appear, in which case the conditions of possibility may remain indefinitely in the same state, without any actual occurrence of the event.

¹⁴ Cf. Gonzalez, *Historia de la Filosofia*, Vol. 4, p. 462.

¹⁵ In *La philosophie médiévale d'après M. Picavet*, *Rev. de Philos.*, 1906.

If we thus understand by the cause of the revival of Scholasticism the conditions which made it possible, we will find it bound with a principle which is essential to the Catholic beliefs, and, more distinctly than any other, separates the Roman Church from all Protestant sects: the principle of the unity and immutability of truth. A brief exposition of St. Thomas's doctrine on this point will not be out of place here.

Truth, St. Thomas teaches, may be considered with regard to our mind or with regard to things. With regard to our mind, truth is in one sense multiple, because it consists in the conformity of our knowledge with the object, and there are as many conformities as there are objects. With regard to things, truth is also in one sense multiple, because the truth of a thing is the very essence of the thing, and there are as many essences as there are things. But truth is also one, in so far as the essence of a thing is eternal and necessary, so that of one thing there can be but one truth.

As regards the other property of truth, its immutability, St. Thomas teaches that truth considered in things is immutable in so far as the essential characteristics are concerned, and mutable only in the accidental elements. Truth, considered with regard to our mind, is essentially immutable and accidentally mutable. It is mutable only in the sense that our mind may pass from error to truth. It is essentially immutable, because it is regulated by the truth of things, which is immutable. With regard to the Divine Mind, truth is essentially one and immutable.¹⁶

This theory as to the nature of truth has been always strongly defended by Catholic writers. They have been unanimous in regarding internal change in a body of doctrine as an infallible sign of error. It is upon the variations that had taken place in Protestant creeds that Bossuet based his immortal *Histoire des Variations*. You change, said he to Protestants, therefore you err.

¹⁶ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, Q. 16, art. 5-8.

Now, this fundamental principle of the Catholic Church is essentially opposed to the individualism which has inspired modern philosophy. Since Descartes to our day, philosophy has not been considered as a stereotyped body of truths. Each philosopher has been the author of a particular system of thought, and there have thus arisen innumerable doctrines, often opposed, sometimes contradictory to one another. This result is essentially antipathetic to a Catholic mind and incompatible with the principle of the unity of truth. A Catholic will no doubt admit that the principle of authority in philosophy is of secondary importance. He will emphatically assert as well as any one else, that every man must think with his own head; but, as he maintains truth to be one and all human minds to be endowed with a faculty of reasoning which works in the same way in all of us, he will assert that we must necessarily reach identical conclusions in our philosophical investigations.

We need but to open the works of the early neo-Thomists to be convinced that they regard the ephemeral character of modern systems as the strongest argument in favor of Scholasticism. Cornoldi's *Lectures on Scholastic Philosophy* are especially interesting.

"There is such a variety and contradiction in the doctrines taught (in modern philosophy)," says he, "that one cannot adhere to one system without openly denying the others. The diversity which reigns in modern schools is so general that two professors can hardly be found, even in the same college, agreeing, I will not say upon the whole field of philosophy, but simply upon its fundamental principles. Moreover, it becomes impossible to teach the same doctrine for ten years. There is a continuous change and contradiction. From the center of the circle, which is one and indivisible, an infinite number of radii may proceed and extend in all directions. In all fields of human speculation, innumerable errors may likewise be found to diverge more and more from the one and indivisible truth."¹⁷

And after having shown the diversity which reigns among

¹⁷ Cornoldi, *Leçons de Philosophie Scolastique*, p. 3.

modern systems, Cornoldi appeals to the twenty centuries during which Scholasticism was taught, to prove that this system, and this system alone, can give an adequate explanation of scientific discoveries.¹⁸

Now, truth being one and immutable, philosophy, which may be described as a rational expression of the truth of things, will also be one and immutable. And if there arise several philosophical systems, one of them at most will be true.

The difficulty now will evidently lie in finding out the true philosophy. Why should the Catholic Church favor Scholasticism rather than any other system? To this question again, the principle of the unity of truth will furnish a satisfactory answer.

As will be seen in one of the chapters of this work, Catholics admit philosophy and theology to be distinct sciences, having different objects and different principles. They have different objects in so far as philosophy is simply concerned with the truths accessible to the light of human reason, whereas theology is chiefly concerned with truths of a supernatural order. They have different principles, in so far as philosophy is guided by human reason, and theology by the authority of God.

Although philosophy and theology are distinct sciences, they often tread on a common ground. Many principles of faith, many truths known from revelation are also accessible to reason. The immortality of the soul and the existence of God may be discussed by the philosopher as well as by the theologian.

The principle of the unity of truth being admitted, we must also admit that, whenever philosophy and theology tread on a common ground, they must be in perfect agreement. As truth is essentially one, a conclusion of human reason cannot contradict a truth revealed by God. Whenever there is disagreement, there is error on one side. But, as the error cannot lie in the revealed truth, inasmuch as the authority of revelation rests upon the infinite science and veracity of God, it follows that,

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

in all cases of disagreement between a philosophical principle and a theological dogma, the philosophical principle must be rejected.

The only true system of philosophy will, therefore, be in perfect harmony with the body of revealed truths. That Scholastic philosophy is not the only system capable of being harmonized with religious dogmas, we have already shown. This is why, after the speculative principles of the Middle Ages were judged inadequate to meet the requirements of modern science, most Catholics embraced other systems. But these systems have not possessed the character of immutability which, in the mind of Catholics, necessarily belongs to truth. Not only this. The philosophical systems which have been successively accepted in European speculation have departed—or have been believed to depart, which, for the point we are now discussing, amounts to the same—more and more from the essential principles of Christianity. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the materialism of the encyclopedists was the only philosophy still remaining in France. It was openly professed by Cabanis, Broussais, Pinel and Bichat. It had displaced Cartesianism itself, though a very limited number of ecclesiastics still adhered to that system. At the same time, some of the emigrants whom the ferocity of the Revolution had compelled to seek a refuge abroad, were coming in contact with new-born Kantism, which they were destined to introduce into their native land.

It seems, at first blush, that the philosophy thus growing in Germany was more in harmony with the great truths of Christianity than the impious materialism of the eighteenth century. Whether the philosophical systems of Kant and his successors may be interpreted from a Christian standpoint is a question which has been frequently discussed and does not admit of an easy solution. It is well known that the modern defenders of Hegelian philosophy in America invoke St. Thomas's authority in support of their principles.¹⁹ For my part, I feel inclined

¹⁹ Cf. Royce, *The Conception of God*, p. 49; Harris, *Hegel's Logic*, p. ix.

to admit that their claim is not altogether devoid of foundation. Although St. Thomas and Hegel present evident points of contrast, it may be seriously questioned whether there exists between the systems they have built that abyss which neo-Scholastics are wont to point out. Whatever the truth may be, there is no doubt that Kant and Hegel have been invariably regarded by Catholics as the most dangerous opponents of the fundamental Christian principles. "More than any other philosophical system, says Jules Didiot, Kantism has been a serious menace to faith and natural virtues in Catholic countries."²⁰ Didiot is more severe still with regard to Hegelianism:

"If he (Hegel) has not intended to mock at his pupils, at his readers, at his predecessors in subjectivism and monism, we must admit that his mind was at times in a state of delirium. It is a shame for the nineteenth century not to have rejected such a philosophy with indignation. . . . That Protestant ministers in Germany may have endeavored to harmonize the doctrines of Hegel and Schelling, of Fichte and Kant, with the dogmas and laws of Christianity, can perhaps be conceived; but that Catholic priests, such as Hermes, Baader, Günther, may have dared imitate them, even from afar and with a certain moderation, is indeed hard to understand."²¹

This influence of Hegel among German Catholics, so vividly deplored by Didiot, was indeed a fact in the first half of the nineteenth century. The Holy See was obliged to interfere. Hermes's doctrines were condemned in 1835 and 1836, Günther's in 1857 and 1860, Frohschammer's in 1862, pantheism and all forms of rationalism by the Syllabus of 1864.

Meanwhile, some distinguished French writers had endeavored to oppose the anti-religious tendency of the day, and to build systems of thought in harmony with the spiritualistic doctrines of the Catholic Church. Joseph de Maistre, Victor de Bonald and Félicité de Lamennais sincerely sought a new method by which Christian beliefs might be saved and impiety checked.

²⁰ *Un Siècle*, p. 377.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 389.

Unhappily, they endeavored to build a monument to faith upon the ruins of reason. The ultimate criterion of certitude they sought in a primitive revelation. But as the truth of this revelation could not rest upon our mental faculties, which had been proclaimed impotent, it had no sure basis and the brave effort of the traditionalists was doomed to become in the end a lamentable failure. Traditionalism was finally condemned by the Church, and, in 1855, its last great representative, Bonnetty, was compelled to subscribe to four propositions opposed to the errors he had maintained.

It is in such circumstances that the Catholic Church seriously thought of returning to the old Scholastic doctrine. An honest endeavor to seek the true philosophy in modern systems had been made for several centuries. But, from a Catholic standpoint, this endeavor had completely failed. The systems which had arisen in the course of time had been gradually abandoned and replaced by others, so that, as pointed out by Cornoldi, there had been a continuous change in the speculative world. The most recent systems, Materialism, Kantism, Hegelianism, Positivism, were opposed to the Catholic faith. The influence of these systems had led many Catholics to advance dangerous theories. A system born of the laudable intention to protect the religious ideals had been a decided failure. Such being the case, was it not better to return frankly to the philosophy which had reigned for centuries in the schools, to endeavor to reconcile it with modern discoveries, to find out whether the old Scholastic philosophy was not the true system which, for so long a time, had been sought in vain? Such is, in my judgment, the fundamental idea which inspired the neo-Thomists.

CHAPTER I

WHAT IS SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY?

SECTION I.—SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY

The word *σχολαστικός* was already in use among the Greeks to denote a man devoted to study. Ueberweg notes it in a letter of Theophrastus to Phanias.¹ Petronius seems to have introduced it among the Romans. Under Quintilian it meant a rhetor or professor of eloquence, and we read in St. Jerome that it was granted as a title of distinction to Serapio for his unusual talent. At the opening of the Mediaeval schools, the term was soon restricted to a purely didactic meaning. The *scholasticus* became the instructor, and the system of thought expounded in the cathedra, the Scholastic philosophy.

A distinguished French scholar, Barthélemy Hauréau, based upon this etymology a definition of Scholastic philosophy which has been generally accepted; and, on the whole, is the best we now possess: Scholastic philosophy is the philosophy professed in the schools of the Middle Ages, from the establishment of these schools to the day in which the outside philosophy, the spirit of novelty disengaged from the bonds of tradition, came to dispute with it, and withdraw from its control the minds of men. “La philosophie scolastique est la philosophie professée dans les écoles du moyen âge depuis l’établissement jusqu’au déclin de ces écoles, c’est-à-dire jusqu’au jour où la philosophie du dehors, l’esprit nouveau, l’esprit moderne, se dégageant des liens de la tradition, viendront lui disputer et lui ravir la conduite des intelligences.”²

¹ Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, Vol. I, p. 356.

² Hauréau, *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique*, tome I, p. 36.

Before we proceed to examine the difficulties to which this definition gives rise, it will not be amiss to make a few observations, in order to dispel all possible misunderstandings.

First of all, it seems that the etymological considerations which lead us to identify Scholasticism with Mediæval thought, ought to make us step beyond the limits of the Middle Ages, and extend our definition to modern schools as well. If it is the meaning of the words that guides us, there is no reason why the philosophy taught from the cathedra of Koenigsberg by the author of the *Critique of Pure Reason* should be any less scholastic than the systems of Duns Scotus or Thomas Aquinas. And, indeed, some writers, following this conception, speak of an Hegelian, a Cousinian, a Schopenhauerian Scholasticism. The ridiculous outcome of this view is obvious to every eye. It transforms into Scholastics all our university teachers. It makes Scholastic philosophy co-extensive, not only with the doctrines of Kant, Hegel, Cousin and Schopenhauer, but with all modern idealistic systems; nay, with the whole field of philosophical thought. What system has not been expounded from a professor's chair? What philosopher has not seen his doctrines espoused in some center of learning? And we would thus be compelled to enlarge without limit the field of Scholasticism, to open its gate, not only to Hegel or to William James, but also, and with equal right, to Descartes and to Berkeley.

And yet, were etymology our sole guide, we should accept this view, strange though it appear. But the original significance of a word does not suffice to give us the key to its actual meaning. According to John Locke, men seem to have been guided by wit rather than by judgment in the formation of names; and a great discrepance has thus often come to exist between the connotation of a term and its etymology. The Greek word *πρόβατον*, which signifies sheep, is derived from the verb *προβαίνω*, to walk forward. Still, no one would think of applying the word sheep to all beings walking forward, to include under that name, not only all our domestic animals, all denizens of the

water and the air, save crabs and crawfishes, but our own selves.

Scholastic philosophy was originally the philosophy of the schools; and, as the name was given during the Middle Ages, it was applied to all Mediæval schools. When, at the beginning of the modern era, thought was suddenly engaged in another direction, and controlled by men who did not expound their principles from a professor's chair, a new philosophy arose, which was not scholastic, and which, after having controlled the minds of the new generation, took possession of the schools themselves, and dethroned the old philosophy, which, for centuries past, had exercised an undisputed sovereignty upon the intelligences. The philosophy of the schools thus ceased to be Scholastic, and the term acquired a definite meaning, and was henceforward exclusively applied to denote Mediæval speculation.

Scholastic philosophy, thus confined to a definite time, must also be limited with regard to space. It would be absurd to extend it to all the systems which arose in any point of our globe between the sixth and the fifteenth century, to make it embrace, not only the philosophical systems of the Arabs and the Jews, but also those of the Hindoos and of the Chinese. It must be limited to the speculation of the western world, which, in spite of numerous internal divergences, of many distinct and definite currents, formed a single whole, of which Paris was the center, which soon found in Aristotle an inspirer and a prophet, and in the dogmas of the Church a cynosure to direct the human mind in the perilous and unexplored regions it had so resolutely entered.

Our definition may be objected to upon the ground that it leaves us in total ignorance as to the import of the system we define. It does not throw any light upon its essential character, and may even be regarded as simply tautological, as equivalent to the statement that the Mediæval philosophy is the philosophy of the Middle Ages. We readily admit that, in defining Scholastic philosophy as the philosophy of the Middle Ages, we

do not pretend to give what logicians would call an essential definition. But, is it possible to give an essential definition of a system of thought? Can we enclose within the narrow compass of a definition the essential characteristics of a philosophy? It is related that Hegel, having been asked to give a brief exposition of his system, answered that it was not a thing that could be said in a few words. An essential definition of a philosophy is bound to be incomplete, and, in so far, erroneous. Mr. Maurice de Wulf who, in his remarkable work on neo-Scholasticism, has objected to Hauréau's definition on account of its failure to give an insight into the Scholastic doctrine, has not been able to give the essential definition which the first chapters of his book had led us to expect. In point of fact, he has given no definition at all. He has exposed, in 64 octavo pages, what he considers the essential characteristics of Scholastic philosophy, has summed up his exposition in a description which contains no less than 242 words, telling us that such a definition is still incomplete, that it contains only a few of the characters of Scholastic philosophy, and that an integral definition should comprise them all.³

An attempt at a more acceptable essential definition has been made quite recently by Mr. Elie Blanc. He has defined Scholastic philosophy as a spirit, a method and a system:

"Il peut donc sembler que la philosophie scolastique est d'abord un esprit: elle est née chez les Pères de l'Eglise et leurs successeurs du juste souci d'accorder la raison et la foi. Elle est ensuite une méthode rigoureuse, empruntée surtout à Aristote, telle qu'il la fallait pour réaliser cet accord. Enfin elle aboutit à un système toujours perfectible, dont les bases se trouvent surtout dans l'œuvre de saint Thomas."⁴

Concerning this definition, I shall make the following remarks:

³ Cf. De Wulf, *Introduction à la philosophie néo-scholastique*, pp. 191-192.

⁴ Blanc, *Dictionnaire de philosophie ancienne, moderne et contemporaine*, art. Scolastique.

If, for the sake of brevity, we limit ourselves to saying that Scholastic philosophy is a spirit, a method and a system, our definition is not essential, because it leaves us in a complete ignorance as to what that spirit, that method and that system are; and is also worthless, because it can be applied to all philosophies, inasmuch as they all possess a spirit, follow a method, and constitute a definite system. It is true that Mr. Blanc explains what the spirit, the method and the system are. But the method is an extrinsic and unessential character. The spirit, consisting in a just endeavor to harmonize reason and faith, is extrinsic also. It simply refers to the relation Scholastic philosophy bears to another science, and ignores the fundamental principles of Scholasticism as a philosophy. Finally, the description of the Scholastic system as a perfectible system, whose bases are found chiefly in St. Thomas, equally fails to give us an insight into the contents of Scholastic philosophy. It does not tell us what the system is, what distinguishes it from modern thought, what constitutes it as a philosophy. Mr. Blanc's definition is no essential definition at all.

Moreover, does Mediaeval philosophy possess any distinctive character, any idiosyncrasy which sets it apart from ancient as well as from modern thought? We fully realize that we here approach a difficult question, which has been already studied from different points of view, and not yet been satisfactorily answered.

Some writers have thought they could solve the difficulty by simply saying that Scholastic philosophy is no philosophy at all. This view was professed by the French encyclopedists of the eighteenth century, who no doubt had powerful personal motives of dislike for Mediaeval speculation. They pitied all who lose their time in the study of such vain subtleties, and Diderot went so far as to say of Duns Scotus that a man who would know all that he has written would know nothing.

This kind of shallow contempt soon spread over all Europe. It became a point of fashion to deride the cloisters and the

monks. The ass gloried in the kick he could give to the dying lion. In the second half of the eighteenth century, Brücker spoke of the introduction of Aristotle's philosophy into Europe as the signal of the most complete intellectual degeneration. More recently, Taine has given the epoch of the great masters of the thirteenth century as an age of stupidity: "Three centuries at the bottom of this black pit did not add a single idea to the human mind."⁵ Mr. Penjon has described the period which elapsed between the edict of Justinian (529) and the Renaissance as a sort of entr'acte during which there was no philosophy.⁶ Hegel himself, whose system presents so striking a resemblance with those of the Scholastics that one might be tempted to believe he has borrowed directly from them, does not hesitate to profess the same contempt. Speaking of Scholastic philosophy, he says: "It is not interesting by reason of its matter, for we cannot remain at the consideration of this; it is not a philosophy."⁷

After modern erudition has had the courage to go back to the much-despised era, and to remove the dense veil of ignorance which covered the works of its thinkers; after such men as Cousin, Hauréau and Picavet have displayed to the world the treasures of philosophical learning which lay concealed in those dusty folios, the superficial disdain of the preceding generation has disappeared, covered with shame. Men have repudiated the idea of a Mediæval entr'acte, and have understood that the "dark ages" are not dark in themselves, but are dark simply for us on account of our ignorance.

There being thus nowadays no possibility of abiding by what the Germans have called: *der Sprung über das Mittelalter*, and Scholastic philosophy being evidently something, the necessity of determining precisely what it is imposes itself upon us. And here the difficulty lies.

⁵ Taine, *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, t. 1, pp. 223-225.

⁶ Penjon, *Précis d'histoire de la philosophie*, pp. 165. Cf. De Wulf, *op. cit.*, pp. 11 ff.

⁷ Hegel, *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 3, p. 38.

It is unnecessary to say that Mediæval philosophy is not a single system. Embracing, as it does, several centuries of incredible intellectual activity, it must needs present that variety of opinions which is the invariable concomitant of all human speculation. A rapid glance at the whole field of Mediæval thought will not be out of place here, and will furnish us with an insight into the essential characteristics of Scholastic philosophy. We shall first examine the problem which has often been regarded as comprising within its limits the whole drift of Scholastic discussions: the problem of universals. Mr. de Wulf has recently blamed Hauréau for regarding it as the sole Scholastic problem. And indeed we agree with the distinguished professor of Louvain in admitting that the Mediæval thinkers did not confine their investigations to a single particular question, but embraced the whole field of philosophy. The problem of universals should not, however, be undervalued, as it contains in germ, not only the Mediæval systems of thought, but likewise the answers which, in modern times, have been given to all great problems of philosophy.

If we start from nominalistic principles, if we admit with Roscelin that the universal is a mere name, a mere *flatus vocis*, and that nothing but the individual is real, the outcome of our philosophy will be materialism and phenomenism. We will at first admit with John Stuart Mill that "a class, a universal, a genus or a species is neither more nor less than the individual substances themselves which are placed in the class; and that there is nothing real in the matter except those objects, a common name given to them, and common attributes indicated by the name."⁸ We shall next be bound to extend our theory to the relation of the whole and its parts; and—inasmuch as the whole bears to the parts the relation of a universal to a particular—we shall have to maintain that the parts alone possess reality and are themselves wholes. When Abelard, in his letter to the bishop of Paris, accused Roscelin of implicitly holding

⁸ J. S. Mill, *System of Logic*, Bk. 2, chap. 2, sect. 2.

that Jesus, instead of eating, as the Gospel says, a part of a fish, ate a part of a word, he was undoubtedly wrong. Roscelin's assertion that the universal was a mere word did not bind him to admit that the fish was a mere word. But it compelled him to profess that the fish as such had no reality; that it was nothing but a complex of ultimate beings, or molecules; and that Jesus ate a certain number of those molecules, which could be called parts of a fish only in virtue of our mental propensity to build those universals which are absolutely devoid of reality.

Nominalism thus leads us to materialism. It is radically opposed to the belief that the universe is a whole, and cannot admit any other absolute than the molecules, the atoms, the ultimate divisions of matter, by whatever name we may choose to call them.

And if, from the objective, we pass to the subjective field, we shall see that nominalism is likewise the ancestor of empiricism and phenomenalism. In the realm of mind, as well as in the realm of matter, the individual will be the ultimate reality. There will be no soul-substance lying beyond our mental states, but fugitive impressions, each of which will possess its own independent existence. Experiences of memory themselves will have no validity apart from the present instant, and we shall be bound to admit what Mr. Josiah Royce has described under the name of Mysticism.

As Roscelin applied his doctrine to the mystery of the Holy Trinity; and, in agreement with his principles, concluded that the oneness of the three divine persons is not real; that the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are not one God, but three Gods, he was formally condemned at the Council of Soissons, in 1092, and Nominalism was thus killed for more than two centuries, and did not reappear till the days of Ockam.

Realism, in its most extreme form, had been professed by Plato; and, as the first period of Mediæval speculation was decidedly Platonic, extreme Realism, in spite of its pantheistic tendencies, became the orthodox belief. It must be observed

here that Mediæval realism has nothing in common with what we call realism to-day. It is the doctrine that the universal is not merely a mental construction, but possesses an objective reality; is, in point of fact, the only reality. Plato, as is well known, had taught that the real world is the world of ideas, and that the phenomenal world, our own world, possesses reality only in so far as it participates in the truth of the ideal world. This view, if logically followed out, will lead us to the conclusion that reality is of a mental nature. We shall be bound to admit with Hegel that "What is reasonable is actual, and what is actual is reasonable." We shall be incapable of avoiding monism in its most extreme form. If the universal possesses an objective reality, then being is real; and, as the universal term being can be applied to all things whatsoever, we shall have to admit that a being exists which contains all reality within itself. It is to realism therefore that most of the pantheistic systems of the Middle Ages must be traced back.

Prior to the formulation of the problem of universals, Scotus Erigena had already maintained that God is more than a creator, that he is in all things as their sole substance: "Cum ergo audimus Deum omnia facere, nihil aliud debemus intelligere quam Deum in omnibus esse, hoc est, essentiam omnium subsistere. Ipse enim solus per se vere est, et omne quod vere in his quæ sunt dicitur esse ipse solus est."⁹

In spite of the incongruity of this view with the teaching of the Church—an incongruity which eventually led to the condemnation of Erigena's work in 1225, Pantheism again developed under the shadow of the traditional realistic doctrine, the *antiqua doctrina*, as Abelard had called it, displayed itself more or less timidly, according to the propitiousness of the times and the boldness of its supporters, and reached a definite form and expression in the teachings of the great Pantheistic school, which flourished at the end of the twelfth century, and counted

⁹ Scotus Erigena, De Divisione Naturæ, cap. 72.

as distinguished members as Bernard of Tours, Amaury of Bene and David of Dinant.

Closely connected with Platonic realism are also the Mediæval mystics. Mysticism, or the doctrine that the real is the immediately felt, is, as we have seen, the logical outcome of nominalism. It is interesting to notice that Mediæval mysticism was reached by the opposite way. If we start from the assumption that the universal alone is real, we will be led to the conclusion that God alone possesses reality, and that everything else is mere worthless appearance. In what will man's perfection and final end then consist? Simply in the immediate union with the One, the Being, in whom all reality is centered; in a supreme contempt for all terrestrial things; in the rejection of all profane learning, of philosophy itself. And we have thus, in a nutshell, the line of reasoning followed by Mediæval mystics.

It was out of the teaching of William of Champeaux at the abbey of St. Victor that the mystic movement grew. Strengthened by the condemnation of Abelard (1121), openly protected by St. Bernard, Mysticism found remarkable adherents in the whole Victorine school. Human reason was mercilessly condemned, dialectic was characterized as the devil's art, and Abelard, Peter Lombardus, Gilbert de la Porrée and Peter of Poitiers were denounced as "the four labyrinths of France,"¹⁰ because "they had treated with scholastic levity of the ineffable Trinity and the Incarnation."

Pantheistic doctrines having been repeatedly anathematized by the Church—as in the Council of Paris, in 1210, in which the teachings of David and Amaury were condemned and their works proscribed—and Aristotle having supplanted Plato as the inspirer and the guide of Mediæval thinking, there appeared a modified form of realism, which had been already foreshadowed by St. Anselm, and probably also by Abelard, and which has remained since then the official Scholastic doctrine. Albert of

¹⁰ In Walter of St. Victor's *In Quatuor Labyrinthos Franciæ*. Cf. Turner, *History of Philosophy*, pp. 302 ff.

Bollstadt, usually known as Albert the Great, must be credited with its first satisfactory formulation. He distinguished three kinds of universals: First, the *universale ante rem*, existing in the mind of God; second, the *universale in re*, existing in the external object; third, the *universale post rem*, existing in the known subject.

This new form of realism, which escapes the extravagant issues of nominalism and extreme realism, has been too often ignored by modern writers, who have represented Scholastics as adhering *en masse* to the tenets of Plato and William of Champeaux. The new theory denies the existence of the universal as such outside the mind; but it admits in the object a potential universal, which may be regarded as the foundation, *fundamentum in re*, of the universal concept of the mind. There does not exist, as Plato maintained, an ideal man which contains the reality shared in a greater or less degree by all individual men; there exist only Peter, James and John; but there is in Peter, as well as in John and James, a peculiar nature, an essence by which they are individuals of their own—not of another—species. The universal ceases to be a word devoid of meaning; it designates the very essence of the thing itself.

The ideal world of Plato did not, however, completely vanish. It appeared in a new form which it had already assumed at the beginning of the Christian era. The world of ideas became the Divine Mind; and the essences of all things were regarded as preëxisting in the essence of God, as reflecting more or less exactly the divine perfections. God's essence was thus described as the *causa exemplaris*, the infinite prototype of all reality. This is the meaning of Albert's *universale ante rem*.

Besides moderate realism, there arose between Platonic realism and nominalism another intermediate theory, known as conceptualism. The conceptualists were at one with the nominalists in denying all objective reality to the universal; but, whereas the nominalists saw nothing in the universal but a meaningless name, the conceptualists recognized its validity as a concept.

They admitted that the universal is real and has a meaning, but only in the mind. Abelard has been regarded for a long time as the promoter of this view. The works of Rémusat and Cousin would rather lead us to regard him as a moderate realist. At all events, conceptualism presents a striking historical interest on account of its resemblance with the Kantian philosophy. It dissociates the mental concepts from the outside reality. It shows that the synthetical unity of apperception is the product of the mental categories, and does not agree with the thing-in-itself, which remains unknown and unknowable.

The problem of universals has thus led us through all Mediæval systems of thought, and might likewise lead us through the whole field of modern speculation. There are, however, in the Middle Ages, as well as in modern philosophy, some questions which do not present so close a connection with the nominalistic and realistic principles. Prominent among them is the dispute as to the superiority of the intellect or of the will. Thomas Aquinas was an intellectualist; Duns Scotus was a voluntarist. His philosophy bears to that of the Angelic Doctor the relation that Kant's system bears to the system of Hegel.

The rapid survey of Mediæval thought we have just made, however incomplete it may be, is more than sufficient to prove that Scholastic philosophy is not properly a system. Most of modern systems, as we have seen, are either openly professed by some Mediæval philosopher or implicitly contained in his principles. What is Scholastic philosophy then? Does it present any character by which it may be distinguished from modern thought? To this question various answers have been made, all containing a certain amount of truth, most of them being nevertheless incomplete.

Some authors have defined Scholastic philosophy in terms of its language and methods. They have claimed that the syllogism was the favorite instrument of Mediæval thought; vain subtleties and endless distinctions its chief characteristics. According to Mr. John Dewey, one definition of Scholasticism is:

“any mode of thought characterized by excessive refinement and subtlety; the making of formal distinctions without end and without special point.”¹¹

These views are true to a certain extent. Syllogism was regarded by Mediaeval philosophers, and is still regarded by some of their contemporary followers, as the most efficient form of argumentation. The syllogistic form, however, is simply a garb with which the schoolmen chose to clothe their ideas, and which they might have discarded without any essential change in their philosophy. It is a garb which is not peculiar to them alone. Besides the fact that all modern systems of philosophy could be presented in the syllogistic form without becoming scholastic, it must be borne in mind that Leibniz not only praised the syllogism, but used it in his discussions; that Spinoza expounded his philosophy in a form surpassing in strictly syllogistic, mathematical character, all that had been written during the Middle Ages. As for vain subtlety, it is certainly a most common blemish in the works of the schoolmen, a real defect, which often mars their most beautiful pages. But the student of post-Kantian idealism, who has been compelled to go over the works of Fichte, Hegel and Bradley, is little tempted to regard vain subtlety as a character peculiar to Scholasticism. He who has tried to clear the Fichtean statement that

“the reciprocal activity and passivity determines the independent activity and the independent activity determines the reciprocal activity and passivity”;

its immediate consequence, namely that

“the independent activities of the Ego and Non-Ego do not reciprocally determine each other directly, but only indirectly, through their reciprocally determined activity and passivity”;

and that

¹¹ In Baldwin's *Dict. of Philosophy and Psychology*; art. Scholasticism. Another definition of Mr. Dewey's will be discussed in this chapter.

“the law of reciprocal determination is valid only in so far as related to the reciprocal activity and passivity and independent activity; but is not valid as related to the independent activity alone”;

who has followed the author in the intricate applications of his principles under the conceptions of causality and substantiality; who has lost himself in that baffling labyrinth of distinctions and sub-distinctions which cover more than sixty pages of the *Wissenschaftslehre*; who has finally got the conviction that this eccentric and repulsive show of analysis amounts to little more than nothing, can hardly accuse the Scholastics of monopolizing subtlety. Applying to Fichte a word which Diderot said of Duns Scotus, he will assert with no more hesitation and with more justice than the French encyclopedist, that he who would know the whole *Wissenschaftslehre* would know nothing.

Another theory, more widely accepted, has defined Scholastic philosophy by its relation to theology. A formula, current during the Middle Ages, and regarding philosophy as *ancilla theologia*, has been produced; and Scholastic philosophy has been either identified with theology or characterized by its professed agreement with the dogmas of the Church.

The complete-identification-theory has been openly professed by Hegel. “The Scholastic philosophy, says he, is thus really theology, and this theology is nothing but philosophy.”¹² The same view has been adopted, in a slightly modified form, by Victor Cousin in his *Histoire générale de la philosophie*, and the fact that it has been recently maintained by men professing so divergent philosophical beliefs as Alfred Weber in Germany, George Tyrrell in England, and John Dewey in this country, shows that it is far from being as yet completely dead:

“The Church,” says Weber, “is the predominant power of the Middle Ages. Outside of the Church, there can be no salvation and no science. The dogmas formulated by her represent the truth. From the mediæval point of view, to philosophize means

¹² Hegel, *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 3, p. 39.

to explain the dogma, to deduce its consequences and to demonstrate its truth. Hence philosophy is identical with positive theology; when it fails to be that, it becomes heretical."¹³

"By Scholasticism," says Tyrrell, "we understand the application of Aristotle to theology, or the expression of the facts and realities of revelation in the mind-language of the peripatetics."¹⁴

Finally, in Baldwin's Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, Mr. Dewey defines Scholasticism as

"the period of Mediaeval thought in which philosophy was pursued under the domination of theology, having for its aim the exposition of Christian dogma in its relation to reason."¹⁵

In order to understand what amount of truth this theory contains, it is necessary to examine briefly the exact meaning given to the word philosophy in ancient times, and the way in which the particular sciences have appeared and have been assigned a definite field.

Philosophy busied itself at first with the whole extent of human knowledge. In ancient Greece, Thales, Anaximander and Anaximenes were primarily scientists. Shunning the mythological explanations of the universe given in previous time, they directed their efforts towards a cosmical theory more in harmony with the facts of experience. It is by an observation of the phenomena of nature—as Aristotle points out—that Thales was led to the assumption that all things are made out of water. Anaximenes explained the generation of fire, winds, clouds, water and earth as due to a condensation of the first ground of all things, air. Anaximander formulated a theory of evolution which bears a striking similarity to the conceptions of our contemporary naturalists. Aristotle himself did not regard any branch of human knowledge as lying beyond his jurisdiction. His philosophy covers not only logic, metaphysics,

¹³ Weber, History of Philosophy, New York, 1904, pp. 201-202.

¹⁴ Tyrrell, The Faith of the Millions, 1st Series, p. 224.

¹⁵ Baldwin's Dict. of Philosophy and Psychology, art. Scholasticism.

ethics and psychology, but also physics, cosmology, zoology, politics and rhetoric.

When, in the course of human history, the field of knowledge was gradually extended; when it became impossible for a single man to apply himself to all branches of learning, particular sciences gradually acquired a technique, and thus became independent. This movement towards specification was, however, very slow. Even in modern times, Bacon has held that the objects of philosophy are God, man and nature, and has included within its scope logic, physics and astronomy, anthropology, ethics and politics; and Herbert Spencer has defined philosophy as a completely unified knowledge, and has published a series of works, of which the titles: *Principles of Psychology*, *Principles of Biology*, *Principles of Sociology*, etc., are sufficient to show that the philosophy of their author is in keeping with his definition.

At the beginning of the Christian era, the respective boundaries of theology and philosophy were not distinctly drawn. The two sciences were even generally identified. St. Augustine had said:

“Non aliam esse philosophiam, id est sapientiæ studium, et aliam religionem, cum ii quorum doctrinam non approbamus nec sacramenta nobiscum communicant.”¹⁶

Tertullian, it is true, had regarded philosophy as the mother of heresies, and had not feared to formulate his famous: *Credo, quia absurdum*. There is, however, every reason to believe that he limited his condemnation to pagan learning; for he himself did not fear to philosophize, and he gave a system of ontology of which an idea may be had from the following quotations:

“Nihil enim, si non corpus. Omne quod est, corpus est sui generis; nihil est incorporale, nisi quod non est.”¹⁷ “Quis enim

¹⁶ De vera religione, cap. 5. Cf. Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 248.

¹⁷ De Anima, 7; De Carne Chr., 2.

negaverit deum esse corpus, etsi deus spiritus est? spiritus enim corpus sui generis in sua elligie."¹⁸

The first period of Scholastic philosophy was a direct offspring of the patristic era and inherited its beliefs. Scotus Erigena regarded philosophy and theology as completely identical:

"Quid est aliud de philosophia tractare nisi verae religionis, qua summa et principalis omnium rerum causa, Deus, et humiliter colitur, et rationabiliter investigatur, regulas exponere? Confitetur inde veram esse philosophiam veram religionem, conversimque veram religionem esse veram philosophiam."¹⁹

We have seen that Roscelin did not hesitate to apply his speculative theories to the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. For Abelard, as well as for Erigena, philosophy and theology were one and the same. It must be remarked, however, that, in Abelard's case, theology was not properly identified with, but reduced to philosophy. In other words, theology simply disappeared. Abelard's position was very much similar to that of the modern Hegelian school. Religious mysteries, if not provable by human reason, were mercilessly discarded. The words: "*Nec quia Deus id dixerat creditur, sed quia hoc sic esse convincitur accipitur*,"²⁰ which so deeply offended St. Bernard's orthodoxy, may be taken as a perfect expression of Abelard's view.

The respective boundaries of philosophy and theology were soon, however, definitely fixed. The system of principles attainable by reason alone was clearly discriminated from the body of revealed truths. In Anselm's writings, although faith and reason are held in close connection, they are no longer identified. He says:

"Rectus ordo exigit ut profunda Christianae fidei credamus priusquam ea praesumamus ratione discutere. Negligentiae

¹⁸ Adv. Prax., 7.

¹⁹ Migne, Vol. cxxii, col. 557.

²⁰ Introductio ad Theologiam; Migne, Vol. clxxviii, col. 1050.

mihi esse videtur si postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus quod credimus intelligere.”²¹

The great philosophers of the thirteenth century were at the same time theologians; and, in their most important works, they treated theological as well as philosophical questions. This fact may account for the erroneous conception which regards them as identifying the two sciences. The truth, however, is that they carefully distinguished them, and gave an account of their differences and relations which would not be surpassed by any theologian in our own day.

Philosophy differs from theology in its object and in its means: in its object, because, whereas philosophy is limited to the truths human reason can grasp, theology also embraces those which lie beyond the reach of our natural faculties; in its means, in so far as the instrument of philosophical researches is human reason, whereas theology is guided by the light of divine revelation.

These principles were recognized by all great masters of Mediæval thought, and have been so clearly expounded by St. Thomas in the first chapters of his *Summa Theologica*, that it is surprising they have been so often overlooked. In the very words by which the *Summa* opens, the respective boundaries of philosophy and theology are distinctly fixed. St. Thomas proposes the following objection:

“Videtur quod non sit necessarium præter philosophicas disciplinas aliam doctrinam haberi. Ad ea enim quæ supra rationem sunt, homo non debet conari, secundum illud Ecclesiast. 3: Altiora te ne quæsieris. Sed ea quæ rationi subduntur sufficienter traduntur in philosophicis disciplinis: superfluum igitur videtur præter philosophicas disciplinas aliam doctrinam haberi.”

To which he gives the following answer:

“Licet ea quæ sunt altiora hominis cognitione non sint ab homine per rationem inquirenda: sunt tamen a Deo revelata

²¹ Cur Deus Homo? 1, 1-2.

suscipienda per fidem. Unde et ibidem subditur: Plurima supra sensum hominum ostensa sunt tibi. Et in hujusmodi sacra doctrina consistit."²²

With a far stronger foundation, some philosophers have thought that, although Scholastics clearly distinguished philosophy from theology and granted to the former a proper field of action, it is in the peculiar relation in which they regarded those two sciences that the idiosyncratic note of their philosophy must be found. The general acceptance this view has received from adherents as well as from opponents of Scholasticism, cannot but lead us to believe that it contains a good deal of truth. It has been accepted, among others, by Zeller, Ueberweg, Carra de Vaux, Elie Blane, Zeferino Gonzalez in Europe, and by William Turner in this country.

"Scholasticism," says Ueberweg, "was philosophy in the service of established and accepted theological doctrines, or, at least, in such subordination to them that, where philosophy and theology trod on common ground, the latter was received as the absolute norm and criterion of truth. More particularly, Scholasticism was the reproduction of ancient philosophy under the control of ecclesiastical doctrine, with an accommodation, in case of discrepancy between them, of the former to the latter."²³

And William Turner, in his *History of Philosophy*, regards the effort on the part of the schoolmen to unify philosophy and theology as the most distinctive trait of the philosophy of the schools. Therein he places the difference which divides Scholasticism from modern thought:

"Modern philosophy," says he—"post-Reformation philosophy, as it may be called—was born of the revolt of philosophy against theology, of reason against faith. It adopted at the very outset the Averroistic principle that what is true in theology may be

²² Summa Theologica, Pars I, Q. 1, art. 1, ad. 1. Cf. also: Art. 2, 3 and 5, in which the nature and the relations of the two sciences are accurately discussed.

²³ Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, Vol. I, p. 355.

false in philosophy—a principle diametrically opposed to the thought which inspired Scholasticism.”²⁴

One of the characteristic notes of Mediæval philosophers is no doubt their constant endeavor to harmonize their philosophical doctrines with the revealed truths. It would not be fair, however, to fail to recognize a similar endeavor in some modern thinkers. One cannot without injustice absolutely assert that modern philosophers have adhered *en masse* to the Averrhoistic principle that what is true in theology may be false in philosophy. Malebranche, De Bonald, Gratry, Berkeley himself, have professed the same theological beliefs as Thomas Aquinas, and have tried, with as much earnestness as he, to harmonize their philosophy with their religious faith. It may be claimed that they have not succeeded so well; but the question now is not of success, but of professed endeavor, and, in this respect, they are not essentially inferior to the Angelic Doctor.

On the whole, Scholastic philosophy is primarily and essentially the philosophy of the Middle Ages, and reflects the essential characters of that time. The greatest power in the western world, from the ninth to the fifteenth century, was doubtless the Roman Church. The Middle Ages were above all an age of faith. It is faith that directed the European armies to unknown countries. It is faith that led myriads of young men to the cloisters where, separated from the world, they devoted their lives to prayer and to study. Under the shadow of faith, they thought of the great problems of the world. Under the shadow of faith they formulated their systems of philosophy. It is for this reason that the dogmas of the Church were for them a guide; that freedom of thought was assigned certain limits it could not overstep. For this reason also the harmony between philosophy and theology, although not peculiar to Scholasticism, is certainly its most distinctive trait.

Scholastic philosophy reached its most perfect form in the

²⁴ Turner, *History of Philosophy*, pp. 417 ff.

thirteenth century; and, in the hands of Thomas Aquinas, became a definite system which might be described as Scholastic more properly than all previous attempts. It is to this system that neo-Scholasticism universally adheres.

SECTION 2.—NEO-SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY

The word neo-Scholastic has been opposed on many grounds.

Some men, to whom Scholastic philosophy appears as a bugbear, have been unable to reconcile themselves to the idea that such a philosophy might be revived. Behind the peaceful professor, who discusses the theory of Matter and Form, they have seen the papal power restored, the Church of Rome dethroning sovereigns and imposing her will upon nations, funeral piles erected anew, heterodox thinkers burned at the stake. As we have already spoken in our Introduction, of the relation of Scholastic philosophy to the dogmas of the Church and of the political influence of the Thomistic revival, this form of opposition to neo-Scholasticism shall not detain us any longer.

Other writers, believing that Scholastic philosophy is essentially a thing of the past, have asserted that the word neo-Scholasticism itself involves a contradiction. They have derided the idea of covering old theories with a new garb, of giving a modern form to antiquated doctrines. Their objection to the Thomistic revival would be perfectly well grounded, if the historical evolution of the world were such as many writers on philosophy seem to profess. But a critical study of the various systems of thought which have appeared on our planet during the course of centuries will most likely render us distrustful in this respect. As pointed out by Mr. Woodbridge, "Aristotle reads so much like a modern that we can conceive his writing after Hegel with no great change in his system."²⁵ Neo-Scholastics believe that, amid some antiquated doctrines which must be discarded, Mediaeval philosophy contains perennial ele-

²⁵ F. J. E. Woodbridge, *The Problem of Metaphysics*, *Philos. Rev.*, 1903, p. 368.

ments of truth; that the fundamental principles of the Peripatetic and Thomistic philosophy can be fully harmonized with modern scientific results.

Even among the sympathizers of Scholastic thought, the word neo-Scholastic has found opponents. Some have thought that the modern defenders of the philosophy of St. Thomas should not call themselves neo-Scholastics, but simply Scholastics, as the prefix neo implies some modifications in a system which should remain intact. St. Thomas's philosophy, have they maintained, should be accepted in its entirety or not be accepted at all. This thesis was defended by C. M. Schneider in the review *Saint-Thomasblätter*. It has been defended more recently by Father Janvier, who would adopt, not only the teachings, but the very method and style of St. Thomas:

“Les mieux inspirés,” says he, “prirent l'Encyclique de Léon XIII à la lettre et s'efforcèrent d'expliquer toutes les parties de la doctrine de saint Thomas en usant de sa méthode et en adoptant son style.”²⁶

As was to be expected, such views have not met with a welcome acceptance. Some parts of St. Thomas's teaching are so evidently obsolete that it would be ridiculous to revive them to-day. His doctrine of the four elements, his belief in the influence of heavenly bodies upon generation, and many similar theories, cannot become again the object of philosophical discussion. The method and language of the Scholastics must also be modified. If the defenders of St. Thomas's philosophy want to come in contact with modern thought, if they want to see their doctrines discussed in philosophical circles, they must needs adopt modern methods and modern forms of expression. An opposite course of action would ostracize them from the thinking world, and thereby render their work null.

It has been finally claimed that the new Scholastic movement, being essentially a revival of St. Thomas's philosophy, ought to

²⁶ Janvier, *L'action intellectuelle et politique de Léon XIII*, p. 49.

take the name of neo-Thomism. To this objection also have neo-Scholastics successfully replied. The Scholastic revival follows chiefly St. Thomas because St. Thomas has brought Scholastic philosophy to its perfection. He has built a concrete system of thought which surpasses in coherence and grandeur all other Mediæval systems. The adherence to St. Thomas is, however, neither servile nor exclusive. The tenets of the other Scholastics are carefully studied and given the preference whenever they prove more satisfactory to human reason. In point of fact, the words neo-Thomism and neo-Scholasticism are often regarded as convertible terms, although, strictly speaking, neo-Scholasticism is more proper.

The first task neo-Scholastics have assumed has naturally been an adequate and critical study of the Mediæval philosophers. The works of St. Thomas have been edited anew and carefully studied. The same has been done with regard to all great Mediæval writers. Let us mention the Leonine edition of the works of Thomas Aquinas, begun at the order and under the protection of Pope Leo XIII, and published in Rome in 1882; the edition of Duns Scotus's works, published in 1891, and comprising twenty-six volumes quarto; the edition of St. Bonaventure's works, published since 1882 by the Franciscans of Quaracchi, near Florence, and completed a few years ago; the collection: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, published in Münster, since 1891, under the direction of Mr. Baumbach; the collection: *Les Philosophes du Moyen Age*, begun quite recently at the University of Louvain.

These historical works are not, however, the most essential element of the neo-Scholastic program. The dearest aim of the neo-Scholastics is not to study Mediæval systems in themselves, to dissect them and present them to the curious, as stuffed birds in a museum. It is to give them a new life, to make them meet the requirements of our day, to render them actual. In order to be successful in this task, they study the intrinsic value of the solutions proposed by the Mediæval thinkers to the great

problems of the world, they reject those which the progress of modern science has shown to be erroneous, they discard useless questions, they accommodate Scholastic philosophy to the modern spirit. In so doing, they act in complete harmony with the instructions given by Leo XIII in the encyclical *Æterni Patris*, whose contents might be summed up in the formula universally adopted by neo-Scholastics as the motto of their school: *vetera novis augere*.

The modifications introduced by neo-Scholastics on the philosophy of the Middle Ages may be classified under three heads:

The first bears upon language and method. Distinguished neo-Scholastics, it is true, cling to the Latin language and to the Thomistic method of argumentation. Some of the most important contributions to the Thomistic revival are written in Latin and do not greatly depart from St. Thomas's method. Let us mention the collection *Philosophia Lacensis* and the works of the celebrated Spanish Jesuit Urraburu. Like St. Thomas in the *Summa Theologica*, the authors of these works begin with an exposition of the various opinions about each question, give their own solution as the body of the chapter, and end with a resolution of the objections proposed by the antagonistic schools. The greater number of neo-Scholastics, however, depart from this strictly Scholastic method. They discard the syllogistic form of argumentation and write their works in modern languages. The fact that the authors who have thus modified the Scholastic method have succeeded in attracting the attention of the non-Scholastic world, whereas the learned treatises written in Latin have been comparatively neglected, shows that modern languages and methods are nowadays more efficacious instruments than Latin for philosophical discussion. Latin is not known to-day; and, as the years go on, its importance will still decrease. This is an evil no doubt, but an evil we must accept. If we present to the world philosophical doctrines expressed in a language which the world ignores, our efforts will be vain, our labor useless.

With regard to history, neo-Scholastics have also somewhat departed from the attitude of their Mediaeval predecessors. Historical investigations were not neglected during the Middle Ages. They were, however, made from a point of view totally different from our own. When the old Scholastics studied the philosophical opinions of their predecessors, their aim was not so much the knowledge of the views of such or such a man as the knowledge of truth. They had not the idea that a man could study history for history's sake, could devote his time to an understanding of antagonistic philosophical systems, and expound opposite theories without professing any opinion of his own. The study of the tenets of the great thinkers of the past is no doubt a most powerful means of getting definite philosophical convictions. A philosophical problem can hardly be solved in a satisfactory manner, when the solutions given to the same question in previous time are ignored. The aim of the Scholastics in their study of history was thus most laudable, and, to a certain extent, must become our own aim.

Historical studies have, however, acquired in our day an importance which the Mediaeval philosophers did not imagine. The doctrines of a thinker are now studied in and for themselves. We try to understand and to imbibe the very spirit of the philosophers. We are scrupulously careful not to attribute to them opinions which they did not profess.

Some of the early neo-Thomists have been loath to enter into this modern current. The late Spanish professor Orti y Lara regarded historical studies as a vain bibliomania.²⁷ This inexcusable indifference has now wholly disappeared. Mr. de Wulf, in a recent work: *Introduction à la Philosophie néo-Scholastique*, in which the program of the neo-Scholastic movement is most definitely traced, strongly insists upon the importance of historical investigations. A similar insistence is found in the numerous articles, pamphlets, etc., published by Mgr. Mercier during the last twenty years. The important historical studies

²⁷ Cf. Lutoslawski, Kant in Spanien, *Kantstudien*, 1897, pp. 217 ff.

published by neo-Scholastics, and of which we have already spoken, show that, on this point, they act in perfect conformity with their principles. Not only have they studied the Middle Ages, but they have made important contributions to the study of modern philosophical literature. Suffice to mention the works of Mercier and Sentroul on Kant, Halleux's *Evolutionisme en morale*, which contains a remarkable criticism on Spencer's System of Ethics, Janssens's treatise on Renouvier's neo-criticism, Rickaby's recent study on Hobbes, Locke, Hume and Mill.

Neo-Scholasticism finally strives to keep abreast with modern scientific progress. In so doing, it does not precisely depart from the attitude of the Mediaeval philosophers. For too long a time it has been believed that the monks of the Middle Ages were unconcerned with science, and, regardless of the data of experience, built their systems *a priori*. This view cannot be held to-day. It is well known that the great Scholastic philosophers were enthusiastic investigators of nature; that Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, Roger Bacon, etc., were true scientists. The prodigious development of science in modern times has made it difficult for the philosopher to possess a deep scientific knowledge. Albert the Great and Roger Bacon could boast of having mastered all sciences. Not only would the same be impossible to-day, but philosophers are often apt to build their speculative systems without taking scientific data into account. And there thus result those strange philosophical theories which provoke the laughter of scientists and bring discredit upon philosophy itself.

Neo-Scholastics have not always escaped this danger. As we shall see in our chapter dealing with neo-Scholasticism in Italy, the early Roman Thomists regarded scientific investigations with the utmost contempt. Their ignorance of science often led them to ridiculous assertions. Thus, Cardinal Mazella, defending in his *De Deo Creante*, the view that the days of Creation are days of twenty-four hours, and somewhat perplexed

by the fossils, which geology proves to have existed in the strata of the earth for long periods of time, does not hesitate to believe that God created them *in statu perfecto*, just as they are found to-day by the geologist.²⁸ It is hardly necessary to say that such is not the position of the neo-Scholastics of the present day. The works of Farges, Urraburu, Pesch, Nys, Mercier, etc., evince a profound knowledge of all modern scientific discoveries. The Institute of Philosophy of the University of Louvain in particular is worthy of praise in this respect. As we shall see in one of the following chapters of this treatise, its scientific department, as regards equipment and results, has got the start of some of the most famous European institutions.

Scholasticism is not thus a dead system studied only for its historical interest. It is a system endowed with as vivid a life as any modern current of thought, a system which must be studied in connection with modern theories, and whose answers to the great problems of philosophy can no longer be ignored. The following chapters will be devoted to an exposition and a discussion of its essential principles.

²⁸ Mazella, *De Deo Creante*, pp. 156 ff.

CHAPTER II

SCHOLASTIC LOGIC

Whereas all other sciences needed long periods of time to acquire the definite, systematic form they now possess, nay, in many cases, to find their right path, logic has hit at once its legitimate procedure, and has been able to reach without delay its complete development. If it has not advanced a single step since Aristotle's time, if our modern university text-books do not give us any more nor less than the doctrine of the Stagirite, it is because logic had become in his hands a complete system, had grasped and accomplished its purpose. The reason of this advantage is obvious. Unlike all other sciences, logic has to deal with the form, not with the content, of thought. It does not examine the immediate assumptions from which we start; it is not concerned with the conclusions we derive from them; it deals only with the manner in which they are derived. It is merely the art or the science of reasoning.

Now, all men are endowed with similar faculties and reason in a similar way. The causes of the divergences of speculative conclusions, of the incompatibility of contradictory systems, are not to be found in the methods according to which these systems are built, but in the fundamental principles which lie at their basis.

In modern times, however, the Aristotelian logic has been severely criticized. Eminent authors have condemned its course of action, declaring its direction unnatural, its methods barren. It has been contended that upon the ruins of the effete Mediæval dialectic, a new science of logic had to be built. Induction has been produced and acclaimed as the sovereign guide of human speculation, while deductive methods have been regarded as useless and relegated to the background.

This view, due in great part to the progress of physical science, has found an able representative and defender in John Stuart Mill. The great significance of his *System of Logic* lies in the endeavor to reverse the process which considered the syllogistic logic as fundamental, and to subordinate the syllogism to the induction. This superiority assigned to the induction is a natural consequence of the nominalistic principles. If we start from the assumption that the individual is the only reality, and that the universal is a mere meaningless name, the syllogism loses its force and becomes a mere tautology.

The syllogism, in its most perfect form, starts from a universal, subsumes a particular under that universal, and reaches the conclusion that the attribute which belongs to the universal belongs to the particular also. Now, as the universal does not possess any validity for the nominalists, they must regard the major premise as containing the conclusion not only formally, but materially, and hence the syllogism as devoid of all logical value.

In the example:

Man is mortal.

Socrates is a man.

therefore, Socrates is mortal.

the major premise: Man is mortal, is not, from a nominalistic point of view, a universal proposition. The term man is only a shorthand register of individual cases. It means John, Peter, Thomas, etc., and the proposition: Man is mortal, may be resolved into particular propositions, and formulated as: John, Peter, Thomas, etc., are mortal.

Now, the subject Socrates of our conclusion either is or is not contained in the universal term man. If it is, then our reasoning is tautological, is even guilty of the fallacy called *petitio principii*, inasmuch as it implicitly assumes the conclusion it pretends to prove. If, on the other hand, the term Socrates is not contained in the term man, it is by a process of induction that we extend the meaning of the term man, which

included John, Peter and Thomas, to Socrates; and the induction becomes the foundation of all truthful investigation, the basal stone of the syllogism itself.

That this depreciation of all syllogistic argumentation is openly professed by Mill, is well known to all who have read his *System of Logic*:

“It must be granted,” says he, “that in every syllogism, considered as an argument to prove the conclusion, there is a *petitio principii*. When we say,

All men are mortal
Socrates is a man
 therefore
Socrates is mortal;

it is unanswerably urged by the adversaries of the syllogistic theory, that the proposition, Socrates is mortal, is presupposed in the more general assumption, All men are mortal: that we cannot be assured of the mortality of all men, unless we were previously certain of the mortality of every individual man; that if it be still doubtful whether Socrates, or any other individual you choose to name, be mortal or not, the same degree of uncertainty must hang over the assertion, All men are mortal: that the general principle, instead of being given as evidence of the particular case, cannot itself be taken for true without exception, until every shadow of doubt which could affect any case comprised with it, is dispelled by evidence aliunde; and then what remains for the syllogism to prove? that, in short, no reasoning from generals to particulars can, as such, prove anything; since from a general principle you cannot infer any particulars, but those which the principle itself assumes as foreknown.”¹

This view, perfectly conclusive for the adherents of nominalism, loses its value if, with the great Scholastic masters, we admit the validity of the universal; if we regard the word man as meaning, not simply John, Peter and Thomas, but a universal essence common to all possible men. The error of the nominalists lies in the confusing the denotation of a term with its

¹ J. S. Mill, *System of Logic*, Bk. 2, chap. 3, sect. 2.

connotation; and, if Mill tries to clear himself from such an accusation, it is on account of an inconsistency which runs through the whole of his *System of Logic*, and appears as a continual puzzle to the uninitiated reader.

The conclusion of a syllogism is contained formally in the major premise, but not materially. As the universal term man denotes the essence common to all human beings, it also denotes the essence of the individual Socrates; and, if mortality is one of the characteristics of the human essence, it will undoubtedly be a characteristic of Socrates. The conclusion, Socrates is mortal, is, however, contained in the major premise implicitly only. We may be convinced of the truth of the assertion: Man is mortal, because we know that human nature as such involves the element of mortality (the human body being an organism, and all organic beings being subject to growth, decay, and dissolution); and not have realized that the individual Socrates is mortal also. The logical value of the syllogistic reasoning consists then in making explicitly known what was known implicitly, in enlarging indefinitely the field of our *a priori* knowledge. Under its dominion lie all *a priori* sciences, pure mathematics as well as philosophy.

The inductive process was not unknown to the Mediaeval philosophers. Without mentioning Roger Bacon, who not only insisted upon the use of observation and experience, but condemned all deductive reasoning, we find well conducted examples of induction in Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus and Albert the Great. A remarkable passage of the work *De motibus animalium*,² in which Albert the Great maintains the thesis that the origin of all motions of animals is on the back of the head, might have been written after Mill's *System of Logic* without any essential change.³

These examples of induction in the modern sense were, how-

² Lib. 1, tract. 2, cap. 1, 2, 3.

³ Cf. Mansion, L'induction chez Albert le Grand, *Rev. Neo-Scol.*, 1906, pp. 246 ff.

ever, exceptional. Their authors themselves considered them as of little importance: "The science of nature, said Albert the Great, must not simply gather facts, it must look for the causes of the natural phenomena."⁴

This undervaluation of inductive reasoning was due to the fact that the particular sciences had not yet acquired a field of their own, and were regarded as forming part of philosophy. Positive sciences, concerned with facts and laws, were as yet unknown.

The case being very different nowadays, neo-Scholastic logic is not satisfied with a repetition of the logical doctrines of the Middle Ages. In harmony with Leo XIII's formula: *Vetera novis augere*, it makes a thorough study of the inductive process.

Deductive reasoning, however, does not thereby disappear. It possesses a field of its own, in which induction has nothing to do. Enjoying an undisputed sovereignty in the science of nature, induction is absolutely powerless in the field of the *a priori* sciences, such as mathematics; in the field of all those sciences which our mind in a certain sense creates.

⁴ De mineralibus, lib. 2. tract. 2. cap. 1.

CHAPTER III

SCHOLASTIC METAPHYSICS

SECTION 1.—EXISTENCE OF METAPHYSICS

The word Metaphysics was unknown to Aristotle. It is probably due to Andronicus of Rhodes, a compiler of Aristotle's works, who was unable to reduce the fourteen books actually known as Metaphysics either to ethics, logic or physics. The word had therefore originally no intended meaning beyond a classificatory purpose. Very soon, however, its connotation underwent a change and was taken to be, not what merely comes after, but what is essentially above physics. St. Thomas brings the two meanings together in the following words: "This science is called metaphysics because its study follows the study of physics, as we are naturally inclined to pass from sensible to supersensible things."¹

General Metaphysics, also called Ontology, has often been defined by neo-Scholastics as: the science of Being in general, or of Being as Being. This definition has been opposed by Mgr. Mercier on the ground that the notion of being in general is analogical, and covers a multitude of things with which ontology has nothing to do. It embraces objects of totally diverse natures, such as substances and accidents. It even extends to the logical being. Now, the logical being has its proper place in logic. As for accident, it is not studied in metaphysics except in so far as it is related to substance. The proper object of metaphysics, according to Mercier, is thus real being or substance. Metaphysics is not concerned with what Hegel calls "Pure Being," and shows to be equal to nothing.

¹ Thomas Aquinas, *In lib. Boetii de Trinitate*, q. 5, a. 1. Cf. Mercier, *Ontologie*, pp. 5-6.

Its vital problem, as Mr. Woodbridge points out, is the nature or character of reality,² and accident and logical being come within its field only in so far as they are regarded as real.

Scholastic metaphysics has met, in modern times, with powerful adversaries who have tried, not only to deprive her of the sovereignty which, as queen of the sciences, she had so long exercised, but to banish her altogether from the world of thought. She who, for centuries, had seen the most powerful geniuses prostrate at her feet, has been driven out, without mercy, from the field of human speculation. She has lingered for a long time, as an outlaw, in some obscure corner of her former realm, and to-day she reappears more resplendent than ever, and dares meet her old foes face to face.

The two great currents of thought which have rejected metaphysics as vain in its object and erroneous in its conclusions are Positivism and Kantism.

According to Auguste Comte, the attempt to grasp the essences of things is a futile endeavor. We cannot go beyond actual facts and laws of facts. Identical are the views of Herbert Spencer. For him, our knowledge is limited to appearances, and the reality lying behind those appearances is and must be unknown.³

Positivism thus rejects metaphysics, is even bound to reject it. A philosophy which professes not to step beyond the facts of sensible experience cannot reach the universal nature which is the object of all metaphysical speculation. It should even abandon all attempts at expressing the laws of facts, and be contented with the immediate, with the "this," which is the only thing devoid of all metaphysical element.

Kant, whose aim was to combat Hume's scepticism and thus to save metaphysics from utter destruction, has perhaps dealt her the most severe blows. He has taught that our knowledge is conditioned by our natural faculties, and that the reality

² Woodbridge, *The Problem of Metaphysics*, *Philos. Rev.*, 1903, p. 375.

³ Cf. Spencer, *First Principles*, Chap. 4.

which we see through the forms of sensibility and the categories of understanding is necessarily distorted by these subjective conditions and never appears to us as it is in itself. It is phenomena that we know. The noumenon, the thing-in-itself, is absolutely unknowable. A science professing to deal with reality as it is becomes therefore meaningless and absurd.

Both Kantians and Positivists labor under the same misconception. All facts of experience have come to be divided into two great classes. Some are known as real, others as apparent. We have observed that a stick which looks straight in ordinary conditions looks crooked when immersed in water. As our sense of touch does not in this case corroborate the conclusions of our visual experience, we conclude that no real change has taken place in the stick itself, that it is still really straight, but appears crooked.

This division is swallowed up by all defenders of the absolute relativity of knowledge. They undo, as it were, the work of experience, and leave us at our starting-point, where we cannot escape the necessity of beginning our work over again. If reality lies altogether beyond our reach, it is as non-existent for us, and the appearances, the phenomena with which alone we have to deal, become the only possible object of research, the only reality. With them a new metaphysics must needs arise, which, upon close examination, will be found to be exactly the one we have rejected.

The positivistic and the Kantian positions are thus untenable. They are also illogical. Both positivists and Kantians reach conclusions that are metaphysical in themselves and unattainable without the help of metaphysics. They assert, for example, that all knowledge is relative and that reality is absolutely unknowable. This is a conclusion about the nature of reality itself, a conclusion which in so far is metaphysical. And if we go on saying with Spencer that the unknowable force lying beyond our experience is the cause of our sense-impressions, or, with Kant, that the thing-in-itself is the necessary condition of

the existence of the phenomenal world, if we know and describe the effects which the absolute reality produces, we thereby profess to know a good deal about this reality, and can hardly describe it as absolutely unknowable.

SECTION 2.—SCHOLASTIC THEORY OF ACT AND POTENCY

One of the most enlightened among neo-Scholastics, Mr. Albert Farges, regards the doctrine of Act and Potency as the foundation-stone of the peripatetic and Thomistic metaphysics. “La théorie de l’acte et de la puissance, du moteur et du mobile est la clef de voûte de tout ce gigantesque édifice élevé à la gloire de la philosophie spiritualiste par le génie d’Aristote et de saint Thomas d’Aquin.”⁴ This doctrine has been, however, so often derided in modern times that Mr. Farges’s words will at first savor of paradox. The Scholastics have been accused of introducing into their philosophy mysterious entities, occult causes, and of moving thereby, in the most strange way, as by means of invisible threads, the whole machinery of the world.

In order to remove all possible prejudices, it will be well, before proceeding to explain the theory of Act and Potency, to quote the opinion of two men who are certainly not biased in favor of Scholasticism. The first of them is Mr. Vacherot. Speaking of the peripatetic philosophy, he expresses himself thus:

“It is the school of Aristotle especially, which is a school of science and of positive philosophy. . . . Nothing is less speculative than his philosophy, if the term speculative is meant for a priori conception. . . . The whole doctrine of Aristotle rests upon a formula, which is the most abstract and the highest expression of experience: Potency and Act, two words which sum up his thought and explain everything.”⁵

Mr. Boutroux likewise, although a sincere Kantian, not only does full justice to Aristotle, but seems to prefer his teaching

⁴ Farges, *Acte et Puissance*, p. 17.

⁵ Vacherot, *Le nouveau spiritualisme*, p. 163.

to the doctrine of Kant himself. He recognizes that Aristotle's philosophy answers particularly to the scientific preoccupations of our time, "répond particulièrement aux préoccupations scientifiques de notre époque."⁶

The exposition of the doctrine of Act and Potency demands, as an indispensable pre-requisite, an analysis of the concept of motion.

The existence of motion or change was denied by the old Eleatic school. It is said that Aristotle, in answer to certain sophists of his time, who endeavored to revive Parmenides's and Zeno's arguments, simply began to walk. This answer, so trivial in appearance, was as profound and irrefutable as could be. It meant that motion is a fact of our experience, and cannot be denied, because it is there and constantly forces itself upon us. Should it even be said that all movements and changes are deceitful appearances and that reality is immutable, one is compelled to admit that those appearances are still there, are real and must be explained.

Aristotle, in his *Physics*, distinguishes three classes of movement: a movement purely local or of translation; a change in quality, which he calls alteration; a change in quantity, or development and reduction of mass.⁷

Movement is thus understood in a broad sense and cannot be identified with local motion. Change of place is rather an effect of motion than motion itself. The essence of motion rather consists, to use Farges's words, in a tendency, a becoming, an instrument of evolution for the material forces of nature, "une tendance, un devenir, un instrument d'évolution pour les forces matérielles de la nature."⁸

Now, the changes we observe in our universe do not take place at random, but according to definite laws. Whenever an object is placed in determinate conditions, it begins to act in such a

⁶ Grande Encyclopédie, art. Aristote.

⁷ Phys., IV, c. 2, sect. 10.

⁸ Farges, Acte et Puissance, Sect. V.

way as to show that it possesses a peculiar nature, that it is a unique individual. In other words, we are bound to admit the existence of purpose in our world. The word purpose has now come to mean a conscious scheme. It has been identified with design. The old Scholastics did not hesitate to use it in a broader sense. They spoke of *intentio nature* or *appetitus naturalis* to designate the unconscious tendencies of lower beings.⁹

When we say that our universe is purposive, we do not therefore mean that it is made according to a plan; that it is designed by a supreme being who directs everything to his ends, who, hidden behind the scenes, moves the whole mechanism. Our world may be thus designed, it is true, but this is not the question now. We only mean that the individuals of our world are controlled by their own character, that they naturally tend to a definite result. We may thus consider in each individual two different states: the one in which it is still undeveloped, determinable, has not acquired the full perfection it naturally tends to; the other in which it is already determined, perfected, has reached its final goal. The first of these states is called potential by the Scholastics, the second actual. A potential being is thus an imperfect, but perfectible being. An actual being is a being already perfected. The acorn is potentially an oak.

No mysterious assumption, I believe, is needed to reach these conclusions. Potentiality is not an occult cause existing behind the acorn and acting upon it in some unthinkable manner; it is the peculiar character which the acorn possesses as an individual, and by which it is distinguished from all other individuals, the property which enables it to become an oak and nothing else. It may be impossible to tell beforehand the nature of the actuality toward which a potential being tends. A microscopical examination of the acorn will not show us anything resembling an oak. An analysis of the potential will not give us the actual. It is the actual itself that will evince the potentialities of the being which gave it birth. The very fact, however, that the

⁹ Cf. Mercier, *Métaphysique générale ou Ontologie*, p. 489.

acorn, and the acorn alone, invariably becomes an oak, compels us to admit that the acorn possesses some individual properties which a pea does not possess, that it contains potentially an oak, while the pea does not. Nothing further than this do the Scholastics maintain.

We are now in a position to understand Aristotle's famous definition of motion as "the act of the potential being as potential."

Between the purely potential state of the being which is not as yet tending towards an end, and its final condition after the end is reached, there are intermediate stages. The new-born child is potentially a Kantian philosopher, although he has not yet done anything towards an insight of the Kantian theory. Between the state of his mind then and its final condition when the three Critiques are adequately grasped, a long period of time will probably elapse. There will be the university stage, in which the young student will learn with amazement that space is in his mind, the following years of struggle against a thought strange in itself and untowardly presented, epochs of failure and discouragement, epochs of partial success.

The new-born child possesses the Kantian philosophy potentially; the full-grown philosopher who has mastered the three Critiques possesses it actually; the university student is in a state of movement.

Motion is thus an act of the potential being; an act, because the potential being which is merely potential does not yet tend towards its end, is not yet in motion; an act of the potential being, because if the being is already actual, has completed its evolutionary process, it is not in motion any longer. Motion is an act, but an imperfect act; an act which has not yet reached its full degree of actuality, and is now completing itself.

SECTION 3.—SCHOLASTIC THEORY OF SUBSTANCE

The simplest observation upon the objects of our experience shows that they may be divided into two great classes. Some,

as a horse, a tree, a man, we conceive as existing by themselves. Others, as walking, cannot exist but in something else. The former are called substances by the Scholastics; the second, accidents, qualities, attributes. Scholastic philosophy thus defines substance as that which exists by itself; accident as that which cannot exist by itself, but always exists in something else.

The etymology of the word substance (*sub-stantia*) involves, it is true, a different meaning. It evokes the idea of a substratum, of some sort of recipient in which the attributes inhere. But, as we have elsewhere remarked, the etymology of a word does not always give us the key to its actual meaning. In our epoch of religious liberty, a Protestant may spend his whole life without actually protesting against any religious dogma. He still calls himself and really is a Protestant.

No doubt the accidents, being unable to exist by themselves, exist in something else; and substance may be thus correctly described as that which supports accidents. This is not, however, the primary meaning of the word substance, which strictly signifies that which exists by itself.

Before we proceed to a more detailed study of the concepts of substance and accident, it will be worth while to examine some of the modern theories which have rejected the term substance altogether, or have modified its meaning so as to render it unrecognizable.

Of the adversaries of substance, John Locke must head the list. Not because he is an open foe. He hesitates, feels dissatisfied with his bellicose attitude, would fain come to a compromise. But all the subsequent and more resolute adversaries have been at his school. It is his principles they follow; it is in his workshop they have found their most dreadful weapons.

Like many modern philosophers, John Locke regards substance as a support for accidents. It is from this point of view that he aims his missiles, so that, to a certain extent, he constantly misses the mark:

"They who first ran into the notion of accidents as a sort of real beings that needed something to inhere in," says he, "were forced to find out the word substance to support them. Had the poor Indian philosopher (who imagined that the earth also wanted something to bear it up), but thought of this word substance, he needed not to have been at the trouble to find an elephant to support it, and a tortoise to support the elephant: the word substance would have done it effectually."¹⁰

He consequently asserts that we have no clear idea of substance:

"We have no such clear idea at all, and therefore signify nothing by the word substance, but only an uncertain supposition of we know not what, *i. e.* (of something whereof we have no particular distinct positive) idea, which we take to be the substratum, or support, of those ideas we know."¹¹

(Let us parenthetically point out a somewhat unexpected metamorphosis. We had believed substance to be a support of accidents. We are now told it is a support of ideas. Our author seems willing to prove by all possible means the truth of his assertion that he has no clear idea of substance.)

Let us not, however, misunderstand Locke. He would by no means maintain that we are in absolute ignorance as to what substances are; he even positively asserts that we have a real knowledge of them. But he adds the restricting clause that this knowledge does not go very far:

"Herein therefore is founded the reality of our knowledge concerning substances, that all our complex ideas of them must be such, and such only, as are made up of such simple ones as have been discovered to co-exist in nature. And our ideas being thus true, though not perhaps very exact copies, are yet the subject of real (as far as we have any) knowledge of them; which (as has been already shown) will not be found to reach very far; but so far as it does, it will still be real knowledge."¹²

¹⁰ Locke, *An Essay concerning Human Understanding*, Bk. 2, chap. 13, sect. 19.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, chap. 4, sect. 18.

¹² *Ibid.*, Bk. 4, chap. 4, sect. 12.

Our knowledge of substance, which had been described as "nothing but an uncertain supposition of we know not what," is now confessed to be a real knowledge, as real as any knowledge we may have, and Locke's opponents may doubt whether his attacks were not merely the mock-fight of a stage performer. He will presently throw his weapons away, and we will hardly be able to repress a smile on reading the following terms of surrender:

"It is of the idea alone I speak here, and not of the being of substance. And having everywhere affirmed and built upon it, that a man is a substance, I cannot be supposed to question or doubt of the being of substance, till I can question or doubt of my own being."¹³

David Hume is, or tries to be, more consistent than his master. His rejection of substance seems at first sight well grounded and unanswerable, and has deserved him the credit of having delivered philosophy from a cumbersome and useless conception, of having done away with the soul-substance itself, as Berkeley had done with the bodily substance.

Hume's attack on ancient philosophy is a sharp attack indeed. He is careful, however, before engaging in the struggle, to tell us—with a certain naïveté—that he does not understand ancient philosophy at all. "The whole system, says he, is entirely incomprehensible."¹⁴ Now, it is perhaps too much to say that a system of philosophy is not understood until it is believed; but it cannot be denied that a system of philosophy is not understood until belief in it seems at least possible. Aristotle was a man whose mental shrewdness Hume certainly did not surpass, who devoted his whole life to study as earnestly as Hume did, who lived in a country not inferior as regards civilization to Hume's own country, who moved in a more intellectual atmosphere, who breathed a purer air. The system of philosophy Aristotle con-

¹³ *Ibid.*, Bk. 2, chap. 23, sect. 1, Note.

¹⁴ Hume, *Treatise on Human Nature*, Bk. 1, Pt. 4. Sect. 3; Selby-Bigge's ed., p. 222.

trived was undoubtedly plain in his own mind. If it appears entirely incomprehensible to Hume, it simply means that Hume does not understand it as Aristotle did, does not, in point of fact, understand it at all.

For Hume, as for Locke, substance is primarily a kind of substratum, something unknown and invisible, which continues the same amid all variations :

“ In order to reconcile which contradictions the imagination is apt to feign something unknown and invisible, which it supposes to continue the same under all these variations; and this unintelligible something it calls a substance, or original and first matter.”¹⁵

But as, according to him, all qualities (such as the color, taste, figure, solidity, etc., of a melon) may be conceived as distinct and separate, they do not need any support, and substance becomes an unintelligible chimera :

“ Every quality being a distinct thing from another, may be conceived to exist apart, and may exist apart, not only from every other quality, but from that unintelligible chimera of a substance.”¹⁶

Hume is decidedly a most interesting man. After devoting all his energies to drive away the notion of substance from the field of philosophy, he reduces to naught, by stroke of pen, his elaborate work, and presents to his amazed reader the following statement :

“ If any one should evade the difficulty by saying that the definition of a substance is something which may exist by itself; and that this definition ought to satisfy us: Should this be said, I should observe, that this definition agrees to everything that can possibly be conceived; and never will serve to distinguish substance from accident, or the soul from its perceptions.”¹⁷

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, Pt. 4, Sect. 3.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, Selby-Bigge's ed., p. 222.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, Pt. 4, Sect. 5; Selby-Bigge's ed., p. 223.

That substance is something existing by itself is indeed the only thing the supporters of the idea of substance maintain; and Hume, unconsciously, unwillingly perhaps, becomes one of their number. There is, it is true, in his statement, an inadmissible element of which I will speak in the sequel; but the fundamental principle it contains is in perfect harmony with the doctrine for which the supporters of the existence of substance contend.

A few more words before dismissing Hume. Substances have generally been divided into bodily and mental. Berkeley is commonly supposed to have done away with bodily substances; Hume, with mental substances. This view must be qualified. Hume acknowledges that he believes in bodies—that is to say, in bodily substances—and thus seems to go one step backwards, to destroy Berkeley's elaborate work:

“We may well ask,” says he, “What causes induce us to believe in the existence of body? but it is vain to ask, Whether there be body or not? That is a point which we must take for granted in all our reasonings.”¹⁸

As regards mind, it is true that he resolves it into a heap or collection of perceptions:

“Mind,” he says, “is nothing but a heap or collection of different perceptions, united together by certain relations, and supposed, though falsely, to be endowed with a perfect simplicity and identity.”¹⁹

Which means that there are perceptions, and there is no mind.

But when, in reading the *Treatise on Human Nature*, we find such expressions as these:

“It will always be impossible to decide with certainty, whether they (the impressions) arise immediately from the object, or are produced by the creative power of the mind, or are derived from the author of our being.”²⁰ . . . “Upon the

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, Pt. 4, Sect. 2.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, Pt. 4, Sect. 2; Selby-Bigge's ed., p. 207.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, Pt. 3, Sect. 5; Selby-Bigge's ed., p. 84.

whole, necessity is something that exists in the mind, not in objects."²¹ . . . "Impressions are naturally the most vivid perceptions of the mind."²² . . . "The mind falls so easily from the one perception to the other, that it scarce perceives the change."²³ . . . "We may pronounce any quality of the mind virtuous which causes love or pride."²⁴ . . . "When I perceive the causes of any emotion, my mind is conveyed to the effects, and is actuated with a like emotion."²⁵ . . . "It being almost impossible for the mind to change its character in any considerable article, or cure itself of a passionate or splenetic temper, when they are natural to it,"²⁶

we feel strangely perplexed as to what Hume's meaning really is. It sounds odd to speak of states of mind if there is no mind. The words I, our, us, themselves become meaningless if perceptions alone are and we are not.

These considerations may give us some suspicion as to the real worth of Hume's famous rejection of substance. They will not perhaps induce us to proclaim with Rickaby that "the acceptance of Hume's doctrine by so many of the philosophers in England is a disgrace to the sound sense of the nation";²⁷ but they will compel us to study the conception of substance once more, to examine whether the philosophy which advocates its legitimacy is not, after all, the philosophy of truth.

It would be useless to pass a review of the contemporary philosophers who reject substance from their system. They do little more than adopting Hume's principles and repeating his arguments. Those among our university professors who have not yet come back to Aristotle's point of view simply tell us in their own words what Hume said long ago. The *Treatise on Human Nature* is their profession of faith.

²¹ *Ibid.*, Selby-Bigge's ed., p. 165.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 208.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 208.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 575.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 576.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 608.

²⁷ Rickaby, *General Metaphysics*, p. 238.

There is one contemporary writer, however, who deserves to be singled out from the throng, and whose philosophy will detain us for a moment. I speak of John Stuart Mill.

Mill accepts the common division of substances into bodies and minds. He defines a body as "the external cause to which we ascribe our sensation";²⁸ a mind as "the unknown recipient, or percipient of them."²⁹ At the first blush, this seems very clear; but, unlike many other writers, Mill possesses the peculiarity of appearing clear at a first reading and less clear when we read him again; and, strange to say, the more we read him, the obscurer he becomes. At one place, he tells us that,

"as we know not, and cannot know anything of bodies but the sensations which they excite in us or in others, these sensations must be all that we can at bottom mean by their attributes, and the distinction which we verbally make between the properties of things and the sensations we receive from them must originate in the convenience of discourse rather than in the nature of what is denoted by the terms";³⁰

at another place, that

"a sensation is to be carefully distinguished from the object which causes the sensation; our sensation of white from a white object; nor is it less to be distinguished from the attribute whiteness, which we ascribe to the object in consequence of its exciting the sensation."³¹

Here, after explaining that a cause does not as such resemble its effects, that an east wind is not like the feeling of cold, nor heat like the steam of boiling water, that matter therefore does not necessarily resemble our sensations, he concludes that

"it may be safely laid down as a truth both obvious in itself, and admitted by all whom it is at present necessary to take into consideration, that, of the outward world, we know and can

²⁸ J. S. Mill, *System of Logic*, Bk. 1, chap. 3, sect. 7.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, chap. 3, sect. 8.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, chap. 3, sect. 9.

³¹ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, chap. 3, sect. 3.

know absolutely nothing, except the sensations which we experience from it";³²

and a little further he criticizes Locke for admitting

"real essences, or essences of individual objects, which he supposed to be the causes of the sensible properties of those objects."³³

Mill's conception of substance is thus far from being clear. There is, however, one point which he has perfectly grasped. He admits that substance is primarily that which exists by itself:

"An attribute," says he, "must be the attribute of something: color, for example, must be the color of something; and if this something should cease to exist, or should cease to be connected with the attribute, the existence of the attribute would be at an end. A substance, on the contrary, is self-existent: in speaking about it, we need not put *of* after its name. A stone is not the stone of anything; the moon is not the moon of anything, but simply the moon."³⁴

It is not easy to see why Mill, criticizing this conception, finds in it lessons of English, Greek, Latin or German, rather than of mental philosophy. When we say that a color is the color of something and that the moon is not the moon of anything, we do not apparently use meaningless words. We speak about the real objects of our world, and describe them just as our experience presents them to us. As we never find in nature a color existing by itself, and we find a moon existing by itself, we feel compelled—not by the necessity of our language, but by the necessity of the kind of reality we have got—to speak of a color as a color of something, and to speak of the moon as simply the moon. It is reality which obliges us to distinguish a substance from an attribute, to ascribe to the former a character which the latter does not possess.

³² *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, chap. 3, sect. 7.

³³ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, chap. 6, sect. 3.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, chap. 3, sect. 6.

Mill, however, tries to corroborate his views by the following argument:

“As for the self-existence of substances, it is very true that a substance may be conceived to exist without any other substance, but so also may an attribute be conceived to exist without any other attribute; and we can no more imagine a substance without attributes than we can imagine attributes without a substance.”³⁵

This reasoning seems obvious enough; and, when expressed in the antithetical language used by Mill, may even appear convincing. A little consideration, however, shows that it lies under a great confusion of ideas. If the clause “an attribute may exist without any other attribute” simply means that an agreeable odor may be indifferently joined to a red or to a blue color, it is undoubtedly true, but does not amount to much. If, on the contrary, it means that an attribute may exist by itself, without any other conjoined attribute, it must simply be denied on the ground that it involves a contradiction, inasmuch as the being thus described would not be an attribute, but a substance.

There is no doubt that we can no more imagine a substance without attributes than attributes without a substance. The attributes are the very elements of the substance, so that a substance without attributes would mean a substance without elements, or, in other words, a thing which would be equal to nothing. But the self-existence of a substance does not and cannot mean that it exists without attributes. It means that it exists by itself, while the attribute does not; and herein lies the essential difference between them.

Some philosophers, while admitting the validity of the concept of substance, have given more or less inadequate definitions of it. Descartes identifies substance with extension or thought; Leibniz, with activity. For Kant, the distinguishing character of substance is permanence: “In all changes of phenomena,

³⁵ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, chap. 3, sect. 6.

substance is permanent, and the quantum thereof in nature is neither increased nor diminished."³⁶ This seems to be also the view which Hegel tries to convey in his usual, attractive language:

"The necessary is in itself an absolute correlation of elements, *i. e.*, the process developed (in the preceding paragraphs), in which the correlation also suspends itself to absolute identity. In its immediate form, it is the relationship of substance and accident. The absolute self-identity of this relationship is substance as such, which as necessity gives the negative to this form of inwardness, and thus invests itself with actuality, but which also gives the negative to this outward thing. In this negativity, the actual, as immediate, is only an accidental which through this bare possibility passes over into another actuality. This transition is the identity of substance, regarded as form-activity."³⁷

Finally, a few authors have believed that substance is essentially a substratum, an unknowable something lying beyond the accidents, and have thus justified, to a certain extent, the confusion from which the thinkers who reject substance altogether have derived their greatest strength. Not otherwise is substance defined by the celebrated Spanish philosopher, James Balmes. He regards it as a substratum, "a thing which is no color, but lends itself to all colors; which is none of the qualities which we experience, but the subject and cause of them all";³⁸ a permanent substratum:

"a permanent being in which occur the changes which are presented to us in the sensible phenomena";³⁹

an unknowable substratum:

"In vain you ask me, what is this being? Give me the intuition of the essence of corporeal things, and I will tell you; but while I know them only by their effects, that is, the impressions which they produce in me, I cannot answer you."⁴⁰

³⁶ Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, Meiklejohn's transl., p. 136.

³⁷ The Logic of Hegel, Wallace's transl., pp. 273-274.

³⁸ Balmes, Fundamental Philosophy; Brownson's transl., Vol. 2. p. 338.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2. p. 339.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2. p. 339.

St. Thomas and the Scholastics, however, regard substance primarily as that which exists by itself; and it is astonishing that Balnes, who, for four years, read no other book than the *Summa* of St. Thomas, saying that in it all truths are contained, should have departed from his master in this important point. St. Thomas says:

“Substantia est res, cujus naturæ debetur esse non in alio; accidens vero est res, cujus naturæ debetur esse in alio”;⁴¹

and further:

“Illud proprie dicitur esse, quod habet ipsum esse, quasi in suo esse subsistens. Unde solæ substantiæ vere et proprie dicuntur entia.”⁴²

Neo-Scholastics universally adhere to this view, and are so far from regarding substance as a support of accidents that some of them describe God as a substance which exists by itself, and to which no accidents are nor can be joined.⁴³

The Scholastic theory on this point is undoubtedly right. We cannot deny that experience presents us with two distinct classes of objects: some of which exist by themselves, while others cannot exist but in something else. An object existing by itself, as a lamb, a tree, gold, myself, is called an individual or a substance. An object existing only in something else, as walking, singing, good health, color, is called an accident or an attribute.

The words accident and attribute, although sometimes indiscriminately used, are not, strictly speaking, synonymous. The word attribute refers to an essential element of a substance, such as reason and a certain bodily form in man; accident, to an element which an individual may lose without ceasing to be what it is; such as health in man. The attribute is one of the con-

⁴¹ Thomas Aquinas, *Quolib.* 9, a. 5, ad 2.

⁴² Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, P. I, Q. 90, a. 2.

⁴³ Cf. Cornoldi, *Leçons de Philos. scol.*, p. 138; Schifflini, *Principia Philos.*, p. 520; Ginebra, *Elementos de Filos.*, Vol. 1, p. 174; Rickaby, *General Metaphysics*, p. 254.

stituent elements of a substance; the accident is not. As this distinction is not of capital importance for our present study, we shall not insist upon it any more.

Substance is thus identifiable with individual, and means a complete object. It is not an unknowable thing lying beyond the attributes; it is the attributes themselves. The essence, as Hegel says, must appear or shine forth. It is not proper, however, to call the substance a heap of attributes, because it is the substance, and not the attributes, that possesses individuality. Instead of defining the substance in terms of the attributes, we must define the attributes in terms of the substance.

Substance is that which exists by itself. Here we must return for a moment to an assumption of David Hume, of which we have already spoken. We have seen that the author of the *Treatise on Human Nature* admits our theory in its essential principle. But, as he regards everything as capable of existing by itself, and hence denies the existence of attributes, the conception of substance becomes meaningless in his hands, just as the expression "relative knowledge" becomes meaningless in the system of absolute relativity, just as the conception of subjective fact becomes meaningless if we adopt the position of the subjectivist.

An analysis of the facts of our world convinces us that substance is not, as Hume maintains, each individual impression or quality. Experience shows that these individual impressions do not, in point of fact, exist apart from each other. Hume's capital fallacy consists in arguing that what we may conceive as existing apart, may and does exist apart. If color, etc., existed apart from any other sensible qualities, it would, indeed, be a substance. And we do not deny that it might possibly exist in this manner. But the question is not whether it could, but whether it does so exist. And our constant experience shows that it does not. Experience must be our guide as to the nature of reality. Hume overlooks this capital truth, and thus sorely confuses the possible with the actual. A railroad may be con-

ceived as existing from here to the moon, but it does not exist. Hume's reasoning would tend to prove that it does.

Substance and attributes are thus valid conceptions, and bear to each other the relation of whole and part.

All other definitions of substance must be rejected as incomplete or erroneous. We cannot identify substance with a passive recipient, as Descartes did, because experience proves beyond the possibility of a doubt that substances, bodily as well as mental, are endowed with activity. Sugar acts upon our palate, a chemical product upon our blood, a peal of thunder upon our tympanum. No less active is mind. To its activity is due the whole progress, the whole civilization of the human race. Leibniz's definition of substance as "the being endowed with activity" is certainly the expression of a great truth. Passivity, however, is another element of our universe, indispensable to an adequate account of reality. Some of the properties of matter, such as extension and inertia, can hardly be explained without taking passivity into account. The fact of knowledge itself, although involving an activity on our part, forces us to regard our mind as a passive recipient, capable of being affected by all sorts of objects, and necessarily determined by the particular reality which possesses the character of evident truth.

Finally, with regard to Kant's identification of substance with the permanent in change, we will simply remark that a permanent element in the continuous flux of things is, indeed, generally admitted by scientists nowadays, and that, if we choose to call it substance, no great harm will ensue. In doing so, however, we depart from the usual acceptance of the word substance, and reduce ourselves to the necessity of inventing new terms for distinguishing things existing by themselves from things existing only in something else.

Our definition of substance as the being existing by itself may be interpreted in different ways. It may be said that finite beings cannot be properly defined as existing by themselves, inasmuch as they have not in themselves the ground of their

existence. God has created them and continually preserves them; and this preservation is a continual creation, so that, if it should cease, all things would be reduced to nothing. Finite beings are thus essentially contingent. They depend upon the knowledge and power of God, who is the only being really existing by itself.

This remark was passed by Descartes, who confessed that his definition of substance properly applied to God alone. Unwilling, however, to depart from the ordinary use of language, he admitted two orders of finite substances: bodies and spirits, and supposed that the essence of body consists in extension, the essence of spirit in thought. Spinoza took up Descartes's idea, and was not dismayed by its pantheistic implications. He defined substance as "that which is in itself and is conceived through itself; in other words, that of which a conception can be formed independently of any other conception,"⁴⁴ and showed that God is the only substance. The same doctrine has been revived—with some important modifications—by Hegel and his school. All monistic idealists maintain that there is only one mind. They contend that, as all things are inter-related, they are parts of a single whole, which is the Absolute, and in which everything else has its reality, its meaning, its very being. A that, Bradley would say, is not a mere that: it also involves a what. And as any that is related to all the other thats, and hence to all the other whats, and thus comprises the whole series of thats and whats within its own what, it clearly follows that there is only one all-embracing what, which is the Absolute.

This view, which closely resembles the Christian doctrine of the Deity, may certainly contain much truth. If there is a creative mind, whose knowledge is the cause of all things, as St. Thomas teaches, and of whom we are, as it were, the dreams, it is strictly true that there is only one individual, one all-embracing substance. But, whatever good grounds we may have for the existence of a supreme mind, we do not know it by intuition,

⁴⁴ Spinoza, *Ethics*, Bohn's ed., p. 45.

and it is upon our knowledge of our own world, of the world we possess here and now, that we build our philosophical conceptions. In this world, we find many individuals which, although related to other beings, are complete by themselves in the sense that we can think of them as independent of any other individual. This leads us to the problem of individuality.

For the Monists, then, there is only one individual. All things, they claim, are so connected that any single object has no meaning apart from the rest. It is true that the same experience which presents us with individuality, obliges us to recognize continuity. We ought not, however, to insist upon one of the elements of our experience and unduly disregard the other. Continuity exists; but, besides the fact that it fails to prove the existence of a mind in which all things are one, the doctrine of the identity of all things in the Absolute cannot have much meaning for our practical life, and appears to us as the night in which all cows are black.

The recognition of a variety of individuals, or substances, becomes therefore a necessity. But the question arises as to what the individual will be; and, on this point, the greatest diversity of opinion still prevails. The most extreme view would recognize as individuals nothing but the ultimate subdivisions of being: the atoms in the inorganic realm, the cell among organisms. Man would thus cease to be an individual and become a colony.

A closer investigation of the nature of reality might perhaps reconcile all opposite views. Scientific investigations seem to have established that all material beings are made up of identical ultimate parts, or electrons. It is likewise admitted that the inorganic and organic realms present no fundamental difference, and, instead of dividing chemistry into inorganic and organic, as was done before, we now regard it as essentially one.

The conclusion to be derived from these scientific discoveries is that the electron is the ultimate individual, not only in the mineral, but also in the organic realm.

A whole organism, however, is with equal propriety an individual, because it is a unique and complete being, with its own life, its proper operations, its peculiar activity.

Finally, the molecule and the atom are also individuals; the former for the physicist, the latter for the chemist. The molecule cannot be divided by physical means. It possesses a unity of its own and is the individual about which the science of physics is concerned. Chemistry, on the other hand, operates upon the atoms themselves. It is by combining them in different ways that it effects the various chemical transformations, that it produces the immense variety of compound substances.

We are thus compelled to distinguish different classes of individuals or substances, which do not exclude one another, but exist in such a way that the individual of a lower class is at the same time an element in the constitution of the individuals of the higher class. (This principle, we must here observe, does not unqualifiedly apply to God, as will be seen in the sequel.)

We have, accordingly:

1. The absolute individual, or God.
2. The organic individual, as man.
3. The physical individual, or the molecule.
4. The chemical individual, or the atom.
5. The ultimate individual, or the electron.

Our list purposely omits finite spirits, as angels, because as they do not fall within our experience, and a knowledge of them cannot be reached by reason alone, philosophy is not concerned with them.

SECTION 4.—SCHOLASTIC THEORY OF CAUSE

According to Scholastic philosophy, cause is the principle upon which a thing depends in its being or its becoming. "*Causæ dicuntur ex quibus res dependit secundum esse vel fieri.*"⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Mercier, *Métaphysique générale ou Ontologie*, p. 529.

Aristotle and the Scholastics distinguish four kinds of causes: material, formal, efficient and final.

The material and the formal causes are the constitutive principles of beings. As we shall deal with them at great length in our chapter on cosmology, we shall abstain from treating of them now. Our present study will therefore be limited to the efficient and the final causes.

In the opinion of the plain man, an efficient cause is that which really produces an effect. When the laborer drinks a glass of water, and thus quenches his thirst, he believes that the thirst-quenching not only occurred after, but was produced by the action of the water.

It has become a fashion in philosophy to deride the notions of the plain man. A student nowadays is often smiled at for his naïveté if he believes that his book is really in his desk when nobody perceives it; he is looked upon as ignorant of the invariable laws of nature if he regards his will as free; he is ridiculed as a fetich-worshipper if he feels the slightest sympathy for the old doctrine of causal power. For my part, I confess that I can hardly part from these naïve beliefs; and, at the risk of being mocked for not having yet bestridden the threshold of philosophy, I frankly take part with the plain man in his realism, his libertarianism, his belief in efficiency.

The Scholastic doctrine of efficient cause has met two classes of opponents: some, following Hume, have dropped out the concept of efficiency altogether and reduced causality to a mere invariable antecedence; others, with Malebranche, have accepted the genuine notion of cause, but they have limited it to the Supreme Being, denying all efficiency to created things.

Malebranche's occasionalism needs not detain us long. There is actually little danger of limiting causality to God alone. Inclined as we are to question the very existence of a supreme mind, we feel little sympathy for a system which considers this mind as the only efficient factor in the world.

We shall therefore limit ourselves to a few considerations which have been frequently urged against occasionalism.

1. Malebranche's fundamental principle that activity is proper to God alone and cannot be communicated to creatures, is devoid of foundation. God can do all that is intrinsically possible; and there is nothing so evidently possible as a creature endowed with activity.

2. God's wisdom manifests itself in the infinite variety of organisms we observe in the universe. From the molecule of the mineral to the elaborate body of man, there is a wonderful series of organized beings possessed of particular potentialities, endowed with a surprising adaptation of means to ends. The paw of the cat, for example, so perfectly adapted to the catching of the prey, is a marvel for the naturalist. Now, if finite beings possess no efficiency; if, when the cat stretches its paw, it is God that catches the mouse—as Malebranche would maintain—the intricate organization of created things becomes a useless machinery. The external world itself is altogether unnecessary; and, should it be annihilated, we would noways notice its disappearance.

3. Our own consciousness, which has been justly called the ultimate court of appeal in the science of mind, testifies that, whenever we act, our own course of action is in dependence upon our will. So little are we convinced that God acts in us, that we feel remorse whenever our action is not done in accordance with duty, and do not doubt that we can act otherwise in the future. It is true that Malebranche admits the freedom of the will; but, in so doing, he obeys his theological prejudices rather than the logic of his system.

Let us now pass to Hume's theory of causation, which is not, like Malebranche's, an object of interest to the antiquarian alone, but is still vivid among us; and, despite its shortcomings, does not seem as yet doomed to a speedy disappearance.

Hume's analysis of the idea of causation is often honored as his greatest contribution to philosophy. And it cannot be

denied that it is a superb piece of work, that it evinces a remarkable power of analysis in its author. If we grant the original assumptions from which Hume starts, we are irresistibly led, step by step, to his final conclusion. But, similar to an architect who would build a stately edifice upon a slender foundation, Hume has failed to probe, in a sufficient degree, the ground upon which he has been at work, so that his elaborately constructed mansion, in spite of the studied arrangement of its parts, affords no safe lodging to the traveler, who feels compelled to shun it as by a natural instinct.

The fundamental principle given by Hume at the outset, and which he keeps constantly in mind, is that all our ideas are derived from impressions.⁴⁶

He accordingly asks what impression produces the idea of causation. It cannot be a quality of the object, "since, whichever of these qualities I pitch on, I find some object that is not possessed of it, and yet falls under the denomination of cause and effect."⁴⁷ It must therefore be a relation among objects;⁴⁸ and Hume is led to examine the different kinds of relation from which the idea of causation may arise. He at first discovers contiguity and succession.⁴⁹ He does not, however, attach much importance to this discovery; and, after a weak attempt to establish its truth by reasoning, he tells us that, if his argument appears satisfactory, it is well; if not, we are begged to suppose it such.⁵⁰

He soon discovers, however, a necessary connection as the essential element of causation; but he does not at first find any light as to the real nature of this connection, and resolves "to beat the neighboring fields, without any certain view or design, with the hope that his good fortune will at last guide him to what he searches for."⁵¹

⁴⁶ Hume, *Treatise on Human Nature*, Selby-Bigge's ed., p. 4.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 75-76.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

An examination of the proposition that "Whatever has a beginning has also a cause of existence" convinces him that it expresses a principle neither intuitively nor demonstrably certain, and he triumphantly refutes it by the following argument:

"As all distinct ideas are separable from each other, and as the ideas of cause and effect are evidently distinct, it will be easy for us to conceive any object to be non-existent this moment, and existent the next, without conjoining to it the distinct idea of cause or productive principle. The separation, therefore, of the idea of cause from that of a beginning of existence, is plainly possible for the imagination; and consequently the actual separation of these objects is so far possible, that it implies no contradiction nor absurdity."⁵²

The conclusion is that our belief in the necessity of a cause must be derived from experience, and Hume proceeds to examine the particular note of our experience to which the idea of causation may be due. When he least expected it, he discovers a new relation in which he eagerly hails the long-sought-for answer, and we are told that the necessary connection between cause and effect is their constant conjunction.⁵³ At once, some interesting conclusions are drawn, viz., that we have no right to apply causation to future experience, inasmuch as we can conceive a change in the course of nature, and therefore that change is possible; also, that causal necessity is something that exists in the mind, not in objects.⁵⁴

Hume does not, however, deny a power in the cause, nor a real production:

"We may remark," says he, "not only that two objects are connected by the relation of cause and effect when the one produces a motion or any action in the other, but also when it has a power of producing it";⁵⁵

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 79-80.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

and further :

“ It will always be impossible to decide with certainty whether they (the impressions) arise immediately from the object, or are produced by the creative power of the mind,⁵⁶ or are derived from the author of our being.”⁵⁷

Some incidental outbursts of honesty even reveal him as identifying the causal action with real production :

“ Should any one pretend to define a cause by saying it is something productive of another, it is evident he would say nothing. For what does he mean by production? Can he give any definition of it, that will not be the same with that of causation? If he can, I desire it may be produced. If he cannot; he here runs in a circle, and gives a synonymous term instead of a definition.”⁵⁸

Such passages as this might tempt us to go and shake hands with Hume at once, in the belief that we have at least come to an agreement. It would not be prudent, however, to act too hastily. In a subsequent chapter, the supposed power and efficacy of causes is examined at great length. Hume's original assumption that all ideas are copies of previous impressions, there convinces him that “ we have no idea of power or efficacy ”;⁵⁹ that, when we use those words, we have really no distinct meaning;⁶⁰ finally, that the power which unites causes and effects resides in our mind.⁶¹

In his reduction of the causal action to a constant conjunction, Hume was—if we believe him—actuated by a most laudable purpose. He intended to rid philosophy of those mysterious entities, of those occult powers, which had so long crawled in the study of the learned, and had not yet been fully dispelled by the enlightenment of the new century.

⁵⁶ We remember that we have no mind.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 160–161.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

Unfortunately, it often happens that a mystery is replaced by another mystery greater than the first; that a most unreasonable demand on our power of faith is made by the very men who are sometimes so difficult to satisfy in matter of proof. This is exactly the case with David Hume. Motions and changes were satisfactorily accounted for in the old causal theory, and become a perfect mystery in his. Let us suppose that the event A has been followed by the event B. As, according to Hume's assumption, the two events A and B may be conceived as unconnected, we may neglect the element A, and reduce the series, A, B, to the series not-B, B. If we maintain the necessity of an efficient principle, we will explain the production of B by the action of A; which, as Aristotle would say, contains B potentially. If we deny efficient action, we must maintain either that B comes from nothing, or that it comes from not-B. But, as, on the one hand, from nothing nothing can come; and as, on the other hand, not-B simply denotes beings in which B does not enter as an element, no shadow of reason is given for the production of B, and we find ourselves face to face with a reality incomparably more mysterious than the causal principle which had been discarded for its mysterious character.

Passing to a closer examination of Hume's theory, we will at once remark that his first principle: "all ideas are derived from impressions," not only is not self-evident, but is absolutely erroneous. It is true that all knowledge begins with sense-experience; but it does not follow that all ideas are copies of sense-impressions. If such were the case, we would never be able to step beyond the data of the senses; we would be incapable of forming universal concepts; even memories of past impressions would become inexplicable, and we could not attribute any reality but to the present instant. Our mental faculties are originally aroused into exercise by the data of the senses; but they possess an activity of their own which enables them to connect what sense-experience presents as unconnected; to reason about given data: to reach conclusions about nature which are

implied in the natural facts, but are not directly given, and must be drawn by the active power of our mind.

Hume repeatedly maintains that the idea of cause implies a necessary connection.⁶²

Now, constant conjunction is unable to give us the idea of necessity. For, what does constant conjunction mean? Simply that in all singular past instances we observed, two events happened to be connected. Each instance was a contingent fact independent of all others. As we cannot step beyond the data furnished by sense-perception, we cannot reach any law of connection between the individual cases, which remain essentially singular and unconnected; so that their multitude, however great it may be, is unable to alter their contingent character. Hume, it is true, grasped this consequence, and tried to explain our idea of the necessary character of the cause, not from an accumulation of individual cases, but from a natural propensity of our mind to pass from the idea of one object to the idea of another.⁶³ It would be interesting to know whether this propensity of the mind is derived from sense-impressions or not. If it is, we hardly see how it can assume a character of necessity. It cannot certainly get it from the sense-impressions themselves, because each impression is a contingent fact unconnected with the rest. If, on the other hand, this propensity is not derived from sense-impressions; if it is a natural and innate disposition, we have an idea not derived from impressions, and Hume's fundamental principle falls to the ground.

Moreover, the resolution of cause into constant conjunction presents the capital blemish of disregarding, in the conception of cause, the causal element itself. Hume closely resembles a theatrical manager who would give the play of Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark.

Constant conjunction and efficiency are by no means identical concepts. Constant conjunction means that an event invariably

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 77, 78, etc.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

comes after; efficiency means that the second event not only *comes after*, but is *due to* the first. There may be efficiency without constant conjunction, and constant conjunction without efficiency.

Constant conjunction between two events may take place without any action of the one upon the other when both events are due to a single cause. In nature, night is invariably followed by day; but is not, on that account, regarded as its cause. Their constant conjunction is due to the fact that both night and day are produced by the successive positions of the sun.

In a mathematical series, such as :

$$(I \times x)^n = I + nx + Ax^2 + Bx^3 + \dots,$$

a definite term, nx , is invariably followed by another definite term, Ax^2 . Their constant conjunction is due to the nature of the expression $(I + x)^n$, and by no means to anything like efficient action.

Efficiency, on the other hand, may appear without constant conjunction. It is true that it cannot thus appear in the realm of the necessary. Objects of nature are determined by their own potentialities to some definite effects; and, whenever they are placed in suitable conditions, the reaction which occurs gives rise to these effects. The like does not hold with regard to free agents. Human beings are persuaded of their own efficient action in singular instances, even when similar cases have never taken place in the past and are not likely to take place in the future. Only once did Lincoln sign the Emancipation Proclamation. Nobody doubts the efficiency of his will in this momentous crisis of our history, although a similar conjuncture had never occurred before and will never occur again. Lincoln might then have acted otherwise; and, should our country be placed in identical circumstances once more, we clearly conceive that our president might take a different course of action. We would thus have identical antecedents, and different results, and would not hesitate, however, to attribute the result in both cases, to the efficient action of the head of the nation.

In physical nature itself, we often attribute efficient action to objects which have not been invariably conjoined. In all our past experience, we may have observed that quinine is an excellent remedy for fever. The ninety-nine patients to whom we administered it were in different circumstances with regard to age, physical constitution and general health; but all presented the identical character of being affected with fever; and all, on taking quinine, were suddenly relieved. We thus feel no doubt as to the efficient action of quinine, and a new patient having got the same disease, we have recourse to our nostrum again. Unfortunately, as soon as the sick man has swallowed our favorite remedy, he feels worse and dies. The result is unexpected. It is contrary to the previous course of things. There is certainly no constant conjunction. Still, we cannot help attributing to quinine the deplorable event. We feel sure that quinine has killed our sick man.

Efficiency and constant conjunction go together in the physical world when one single agent is at work. But when several causes are acting in different directions, they may incidentally meet, and, by their conjunction, give rise to an unexpected result, which presents no necessary connection with any of the particular causes, and is simply attributed to chance, although the causes at work have been efficient factors. This is exactly what happens in the case of our sick man. A chemist could tell us beforehand the result of his experiments, because he has to do with materials directly acting upon one another, and whose action is not thwarted by appreciable contrary forces. But the chemical products used by the physician do not necessarily act in accordance with his expectation because the inner nature of the patient reacts and often produces effects which had not been anticipated. Had Hume been interested in medicine, he might have felt some suspicion as to the value of his identification of efficiency with constant conjunction.

What he has missed is the reaction itself which takes place as soon as the two agents are brought together. He has seen the

antecedent conditions, the subsequent result; he has overlooked the very instant in which the causal action occurs.

The philosophy of invariable sequence thus falls heavily to the ground under the weight of its unfounded assumptions and absurd consequences, without any hope of ever being able to rise again. The efficient action of Aristotle and the schoolmen, proud of its decisive victory, appears on the field anew as the only theory capable of giving a satisfactory account of experience. It shows us that in all cases in which a reaction takes place, a result not only follows some definite antecedents, but is due to their natural potentialities; that the quenching of fire follows the application of water precisely because water is endowed with a capacity for quenching fire; a capacity which other agents, such as cotton, do not possess, inasmuch as these agents, being placed in similar conditions, similar results do not follow.

The much ridiculed answer that opium causes sleep because it possesses a dormitive virtue, is not only the expression of common sense, but a highly philosophic truth. It is the best, nay the only answer that could possibly be given. Since Molière wrote his play, and the Parisian theatre-goers stupidly laughed at what the talent of the poet was able to present in so comical a light, the burst of laughter has spread all over the world. Everybody has jeered at the foolish reply; but, for powerful reasons, no one has ever been able to correct it.

The problem of final causes has been sometimes formulated in the following picturesque form: The bird has wings, and it flies. Does it fly because it has wings, or has it wings to fly?

As Mgr. Mercier remarks,⁶⁴ this formulation of the problem is unfortunate. It seems to imply that the efficient and the final causes exclude each other; a principle which all advocates of finality would undoubtedly reject.

The final cause may be defined as the good for the sake of

⁶⁴ Mercier, *Métaphysique générale ou Ontologie*, p. 481.

which the efficient cause acts, "*hoc dicimus esse finem in quod tendit impetus agentis.*"⁶⁵

The final cause may be considered in rational and irrational beings. In rational beings, it is a known and accepted end which determines their present acts. In irrational beings, it is a controlling factor, a natural end to which they irresistibly tend.

All beings act for an end, and it is this end that determines their activity. If an agent were not tending to a definite end, it would be indifferent towards acting in this or that way, and consequently would never begin to act.

The existence of final causes, thus demonstrable *a priori*, may equally be proved from experience. There is little doubt that conscious beings act with an end in view. The young man who wants to become a skilful physician begins by studying chemistry and anatomy; afterwards submits to a long and perhaps wearisome course in a medical school; voluntarily abstains from numberless enjoyments towards which he feels naturally inclined, but which would divert his attention from the goal he wants to reach; spends his days and a good part of his nights perusing bulky volumes which, in other circumstances, he would regard as sovereignly tedious. Why does this young man submit to such an irksome task? What enables him to throw off his natural indolence? Simply the end he has in view, the good he purposes to obtain. This good which, by its attraction, exercises such a powerful influence upon the activity of the student, is evidently a cause.

In unconscious beings, there exists a similar determining principle. The acorn buried in the ground tends to a definite end. If placed in a favorable environment, it will not act at random, but will insensibly approach the goal it has been assigned by nature. Every succeeding day will witness a more complete actualization of the oak, which at first existed only in a potential form. Only when this end is reached shall the

⁶⁵ Thomas Aquinas, *Contra Gentiles*, Lib. 3, cap. 2.

tendency of the acorn cease; only then shall its final purpose be realized.

These considerations forcibly impose the final cause upon the attention of the philosopher. Even among defenders of modern thought, the old Scholastic problem of finality reappears. In a remarkable essay published in the *Hibbert Journal*, Mr. George Henslow quite recently developed a theory at bottom identical with the teaching of the schoolmen. He gave to the old *causa finalis* the name of "directivity":

"Suppose a kitten and a young hawk are brought up on precisely the same animal food, both being carnivorous, one develops into a cat, with fur, having bones and muscles, etc., of totally different character from those of the adult hawk, with feathers, etc. The same molecules of food supplied the materials for the building up of their bodies: why are the results so totally different? So, too, in all animals and vegetables: why should certain substances be guided to certain places—salts of lime to bones, silica to teeth and claws, phosphate to brain, etc. The molecules are first driven about mechanically in the blood by certain forces; various chemical combinations are made under the action of other forces; but what directs all the forces which finally impel the new-made molecules to take up certain positions and no others in the building up of a body? Directivity is a useful word to express the fact. It commits one to nothing as to its source; but it at least supplies a term to express the analogy between the chemist's mind and Nature's—what?"⁶⁶

Scientists, it may be observed, leave final causes entirely out of account, and feel little more sympathy for efficient causes. It is the scientific development of modern times that has contributed more than anything else to the apparent discredit of the causal theory. It might even be added that the wilful neglect of causal action has been a most efficient factor in the development of science. Why, then, should the metaphysician cling to a theory whose downfall has been such a blessing to mankind?

⁶⁶ Henslow, *Directivity*; *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. 6 (October, 1907), pp. 150-151.

Would it not be better to discard efficiency and finality from the field of philosophy as well as from the field of science?

No doubt this is a real difficulty. It is the point which empiricists and positivists love to emphasize, and it gives them so strong a foothold that, despite the ungrounded assumptions and irrational consequences of their system, they bravely hold their own. It must be remarked, however, that the scientist and the metaphysician have very different problems to face. Science is concerned merely with facts and results. The chemist has simply to establish the fact that, if two grams of hydrogen and sixteen grams of oxygen are brought together and submitted to the action of the electric spark, water will invariably follow. The biologist needs not go beyond the actual conditions necessary to the duplication and development of the cell. For him, a monster is no less natural than a normal organism. Science, as Pasteur clearly pointed out, is essentially positivistic.

But, does the scientific position solve the enigma of the world? Does it satisfy our thirst for knowledge? Are there not many genuine problems which science does not approach? Why is the proportion 2 to 16 necessary for the production of water? Why do organisms usually reach a normal development, and are monsters so rare? These are questions which the metaphysician alone is able to answer. He alone is concerned with the ultimate nature of reality. He alone professes to make a thinking study of things. The scientist formulates the law that an embryo placed in such and such circumstances will develop into such an organism. The metaphysician takes up these scientific facts, studies their mutual connections and implications, and is led by the facts themselves to the conclusion that the embryo does not develop at random, but is constantly controlled and tends to a definite result.

CHAPTER IV

SCHOLASTIC COSMOLOGY

SECTION I.—CHIEF HYPOTHESES AS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF MATTER

The question of the constitution of matter is one of those fundamental problems which, in the course of human investigation, have been most widely discussed, and of which an adequate solution will perhaps never be attained. It is one of those questions before which, according to Herbert Spencer, human reason must humbly confess its powerlessness; a question which seems to prove a mystery for the human mind and to point to the existence of the unknowable in nature.

All attempts at a solution of this great problem may be classified under two heads: they are all, in some way, connected with the two theories of Atomism and Dynamism.

The atomistic theory sprung originally from ancient Greece. According to Aristotle and Theophrastus, it is to Leucippus that we must attribute the honor of its discovery. But, as we know so little of Leucippus, and as his very existence has even been called into doubt,¹ we generally consider Democritus, his illustrious disciple, as the founder of the system.

The loss of all the writings of Democritus is indeed one of the most deplorable facts in the history of human investigation. With what burning interest would we not follow the efforts of his genius to get rid of the untenable hypotheses of his contemporaries and to reach a satisfactory exposition of the intrinsic nature of things! And still, deplorable though it be, such a loss is unhappily a fact; and our only substitute for a study of the philosophy of Democritus is to turn to its poetical exposi-

¹ Cf. John Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 350.

tion, as given by Lucretius in his justly admired poem *De Rerum Natura*.

The atomistic theory has undergone, in the course of time, many profound modifications. Hard atoms and absolute void were the only elements which Democritus supposed to exist in nature. In recent times, there has arisen the idea of a universal medium, of a fluid everywhere present, penetrating all bodies, and serving as a connecting-link between the atoms.

The existence of the ether is indeed only a hypothesis, but it is a hypothesis that has been rendered very probable by scientific discoveries; and now, it may almost be considered as an established fact. At present we will not discuss the probabilities in favor of each of the particular ether theories that have been brought forward. This theme will be fully treated in one of the ensuing sections of this chapter. Suffice it to say that, although all physicists do not agree as to the inherent constitution of ether, they all unanimously affirm its existence.

Atomism admits only matter and passive motion in nature. Still, a majority of thinkers did not deem these two elements sufficient to account for the activity which our everyday experience shows us to exist in the universe, and therefore they thought it indispensable to introduce into nature the element of force. And thus the theory of Dynamism originated.

We shall refrain from presenting the various theories held by the ancient Greeks, which might be termed dynamic. We shall not even touch upon Leibniz's famous doctrine of monads, but we shall consider as the true representative of Dynamism the Jesuit Boscovich. Instead of the hypothesis of hard atoms, Boscovich proposed to consider nature as formed of unextended points, of indivisible centers of force, which mutually attract and repel each other, are therefore capable of furnishing a satisfactory explanation of the activity manifested in nature, and give us the illusion of continuous extension, in the same way as points placed very near each other might lead us to believe in their forming continuous letters.

Scholastic cosmology might be described as an intermediate position between the two systems just outlined. Its defenders reproach atomists for denying activity to nature, and contend that an explanation of all the phenomena of the world by mere matter and passive motion is forever doomed to remain a fruitless attempt. On the other hand, they consider the dynamic view to be similarly inadequate. They assert that, although passivity cannot be the only element in nature, its very existence must not be denied, and they put forward the theory of Matter and Form as the only possible explanation of the universe.

I must here confess that I have never felt for the theory of Matter and Form that unreserved sympathetic feeling where-with I have subscribed to so many Scholastic doctrines. I cannot help regarding the Thomistic cosmology as arbitrary, assailable in many points, inconsistent with our advanced scientific discoveries. The fact that physics and chemistry unanimously adhere to some form of atomism is of great significance. Scholastics are perfectly justified in insisting on the shortcomings of Atomism and Dynamism. They are right when they assert that activity, as well as passivity, must be admitted in the composition of our world. Unhappily, the theory they propose does not rest upon cogent reasons, and therefore it should be frankly rejected, or made to undergo important modifications.

The most cursory observation, Scholastics would say, suffices to show in all matter the element of quantity. A solid may become a liquid and a liquid a gas. A body may be made to assume an infinite number of forms: its volume may be increased or decreased; it may, by chemical combination, acquire a nature utterly different from the one it formerly possessed; but in all these transformations, in all these fundamental changes, there remains the element of quantity, unchanged and unchangeable, always identical with itself, and which thus seems to be a common element in all material things.

On the other hand, we cannot help observing the greatest diversity in nature. We find in every object an immense num-

ber of peculiar, specific properties. We have before our eyes the great division of bodies into inorganic and organic. In the inorganic realm, we have solids, liquids and gases, metalloids and metals, the simple elements which chemistry has found to exist, and whose number is daily increased by scientific research. We have the innumerable combinations of those elements, and the appearance in compound bodies of properties essentially different from those of their simple constituents.

And if we turn our eyes to the sphere of life, if we consider the infinite chain of living beings, from the amœba swimming in our blood to the more highly-developed body of man—subjects of inexhaustible research to the scientific mind—are we not struck with wonder and amazement?

When we consider with a philosophic mind these properties of matter, we see that its qualitative variety and its quantitative identity are diametrically opposite. It is this opposition that led the Scholastics to affirm that such properties must be the result of different principles.

Another argument in favor of the existence of Matter and Form, at least as strongly insisted upon as the one we have just explained, is derived from the supposed essential transformations that take place in chemical combinations: “*Dans ce fait bien compris et sagement interprété, says Mr. Nys, est contenue comme en germe toute la théorie de l’Ecole sur la nature des corps.*”²

In a chemical combination, Scholastics are prone to say, something remains and something is changed. That something is changed—or, in other words, that a new substance is produced—is proved beyond any doubt by the fact that the physical properties of the compound differ essentially from those of their constituent elements. It is no less true that something remains, for otherwise we would not have a change, but a real creation. The new element is a substantial part of the compound, because it distinguishes it from its simple constituents. The stable ele-

² Nys, *Cosmologie*, p. 170.

ment is also a substantial part of the compound. It is the determinable principle which, actuated by the new element, has given rise to a new substance. The new element is the substantial form; the stable element, primordial matter.

Francisco Ginebra, following Thomas Aquinas, gives of Matter and Form the following definitions:

“Form is the incomplete substance which determines matter and constitutes it in a determinate species. Matter is the incomplete material substance which, actuated by the substantial form, produces a complete corporeal substance.”³

Matter is then, in the Scholastic system, the passive element of objects. It is the same in all material things, which acquire their diversity by means of the substantial form. But primordial matter cannot exist in a state of isolation; it is necessarily united to the substantial form, and the infinite variety of these forms is the cause of all the diversity we behold in nature.

SECTION 2.—NATURE AND PROPERTIES OF PRIMORDIAL MATTER

To have a fair idea of what Primordial Matter is—or, to speak more definitely, of what is meant by that term—is indeed a most arduous task, one whose difficulty is enhanced still further by the unsubstantial and indefinite character of the conception itself.

This difficulty is recognized by all Scholastic philosophers and frankly admitted by one of the most ardent sympathizers of peripatetic philosophy, Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire:

“As to these abstractions,” says he in the Preface to his *Physiques*, “the most difficult point is to understand them; but, once understood, they appear neither false nor useless. Therefore, instead of rejecting this formula, one must endeavor to know what it signifies.”⁴

Albert Farges, in his most valuable work on the subject,

³ Ginebra, *Elementos de Filosofia*, Vol. 1, p. 200.

⁴ Saint-Hilaire, *Physique*, Préface, p. 38.

deems it helpful to give us at first a negative definition: "To say what Primordial Matter is not, says he, is a very easy thing."⁵ He then proceeds to show that it is neither a substance nor an accident; and that, for this reason, it cannot fall within the group of Aristotle's categories:

"Can primordial matter be classed as one of the categories? It is clear that it cannot; as it is neither an attribute nor a complete substance, and categories do not comprise but these two sorts of realities."⁶

This passage is of the utmost importance, for Aristotle himself understood by categories the supreme genera to which the ideas of all things could be reduced, and the same view is still held by Scholastic philosophers. We are thus led to the view that primordial matter is not a reality.

The doubtful character of the existence of primordial matter was felt even in the Middle Ages. From the very works of the founders of Scholastic philosophy, many extracts might be adduced, to show how slender was the foundation whereon Scholastic cosmology was reared. St. Thomas Aquinas, in his opus-cule entitled *De principiis naturæ*, makes the following significant assertion:

"Materia dicitur quod habet esse ex eo quod sibi advenit, quia de se esse incompletum, immo nullum esse habet."⁷

It is here clearly stated that primordial matter not only has an incomplete being, but has no being at all.

In the *Summa contra Gentiles*, the Angelic Doctor speaks again in almost the same way:

"Ipsum esse," says he, "non est proprius actus materiae, sed substantiæ totius; ejus enim actus est esse, de quo possumus dicere quod sit. Esse autem non dicitur de materia sed de toto."⁸

⁵ Farges, *Matière et Forme*, p. 138.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

⁷ Thomas Aquinas, *De principiis naturæ*, xxxi, in init.

⁸ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles*, lib. 2, cap. 54.

Other similar statements are quoted and discussed by Duns Scotus. In his treatise *De Rerum Principio* (Quaestio VII), he warns us against the teaching of a few authors who seem to regard primordial matter as a mere potentiality without an actual existence. Among the philosophers he thus mentions, we find the names of Plato, Aristotle, and St. Augustine. But these writers do not, according to Scotus, really teach that primordial matter does not exist. They simply have in mind the fact that, of all existing things, it has the smallest degree of actuality.

Scotus then passes to a direct proof of the existence of primordial matter, and brings two classes of arguments: the first from authority, the second from the light of reason.

The proofs taken by him from reason are four in number and read thus:

1. "Si materia non esset aliqua res actu, ejus entitas non distingueretur ab entitate et actualitate formæ, et sic nullam realem compositionem faceret eum ea."

2. "Inter ens actu et nihil, non est medium; ergo si materia præter formam non habet aliquem actum essendi, erit nihil; ergo agens creatum ageret de nihilo, cum agat de materia."

3. "Secundum Philosophos, materia est in potentia ad alia; sed secundum eos, nihil ad nihil est in potentia: ergo materia, ut materia, non est nihil: ergo habet aliquem actum de se, et si non subsistentiæ, tamen existentiae."

4. "Item, posse pati ad materiam reducitur, sicut agere ad formam; sed quod non est aliquid actu, non est principium patiendi, nec fundamentum; ergo necessario materia habet actualitatem aliam ab actualitate formæ, in qua actualitate formæ fundantur, et stabiliuntur."⁹

These four proofs are simply intended to demonstrate that, if we admit the theory of matter and form, we must regard primordial matter as something actual. There is, however, another alternative: the rejection of the theory of matter and form. This alternative, unhappily, Duns Scotus does not consider.

⁹ Duns Scotus, *De Rerum Principio*, Q. 7, art. 1.

At the risk of intruding too much upon the patience of our readers, we will reproduce the words of a devoted seeker after truth, of a man who strove during his whole life to reach a satisfactory knowledge of nature, to understand in a clear and definite way what, in the thought of his time, was still obscure and indefinite. St. Augustine, in that sublime work which is not only a humble confession of his life and a profound study of the human heart, but likewise a treatise in which the philosophy of his time is exposed and skillfully analyzed, considers thus the question of matter and form:

“But I, Lord, if I would, by my tongue and my pen, confess unto thee the whole, whatever Thyself hath taught me of that matter—the name whereof hearing before, and not understanding, when they who understood it not, told me of it, so I conceived of it as having innumerable forms and diverse, and therefore did not conceive it at all, my mind tossed up and down foul and horrible ‘forms’ out of all order, but yet ‘forms’; and I called it without form, not that it wanted all form, but because it had such as my mind would, if presented to it, turn from, as unwonted and jarring, and human frailness would be troubled at. And still that which I conceived was without form, not as being deprived of all form, but in comparison of more beautiful forms; and true reason did persuade me, that I must utterly uncase it of all remnants of form whatsoever, if I would conceive matter absolutely without form; and I could not; for sooner could I imagine that not to be at all, which should be deprived of all form, than conceive a thing betwixt form and nothing, neither formed, nor nothing, a formless almost nothing.”¹⁰

We conjecture that the state of mind which St. Augustine here describes as having been his own has also been experienced by many a student who has tried to represent to himself clearly and distinctly what primordial matter is. It appears, in one form or other, in the writings of all the masters of Scholasticism, who, although they unanimously maintain that primordial

¹⁰ St. Augustine, *Confessions*, Bk. XII, art. 6; Pusey's ed., p. 251.

matter actually exists, cannot fail to recognize that its actuality is indeed very weak, and even to drop here and there a word tending to show that it has really no actuality at all.

Let us now pass to a positive exposition of the nature and properties of primordial matter.

In the foregoing section of this chapter we have given the following definition, which would be accepted by all Scholastics: Matter is the incomplete material substance which, actuated by the substantial form, produces a complete corporeal substance.

All substances, according to this view, are composed of two real, distinct, unisolable principles: matter and form. Matter is the same in all bodies, and it is form, and form alone, that is the cause of the infinite variety of material things: "*Omnium generabilium et corruptibilium est eadem materia.*"¹¹ Matter and form, on account of their unisolable character, are incomplete substances, and it is from their mutual union that complete corporeal substances arise.

Changes in things are classified as accidental or essential. In accidental changes, such as occur in physical processes, the form remains identical with itself. But in essential changes, such as chemical combinations, matter alone remains. The substantial form which existed before the combination ceases to exist, and there arises a new form as the cause of the new substance of which experience evidences the appearance.

The fact of chemical combination plays an important part in Scholastic cosmology; and, although a few Mediaeval philosophers, such as Albert the Great, taught that the elements remained in the compound, and one of the greatest among the neo-Scholastics, Liberatore, holds that the theory of essential changes in chemical processes is not necessarily connected with the Scholastic system, it is nevertheless incontrovertible that the great majority of Scholastics admit in chemical combinations an essential transformation, and we have seen how Mr. Nys bases

¹¹ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, P. 1, Q. 56.

on this very transformation his strongest argument for the existence of matter and form.

According to this view, oxygen and hydrogen do not really exist in water, as there takes place, in the act of combination, a real change of nature. The only means of knowing the truth in this matter is experience; but the most powerful microscopes show us, in the particles of a compound, the most perfect homogeneity, and the dissolvents of its simple elements have upon it no effect whatsoever. The atomistic view that an atom of water is a mere juxtaposition of two atoms of hydrogen and one of oxygen is consequently pronounced to be arbitrary and unscientific, and unable to account for the essential difference which exists between a simple mixture and a combination.

And here Farges brings forth the example of gunpowder, in which the three elements of saltpeter, sulphur and carbon are so intimately intermingled that no microscope enables us to discern their presence. Still, the heterogeneity of the compound and its character of mixture can be shown by means of dissolvents. Water dissolves saltpeter and has no effect whatever upon sulphur and carbon; then another chemical product may eliminate sulphur, leaving carbon in a state of isolation.

On the other hand, no dissolvent of the elements of a chemical combination has any effect upon the compound. Its homogeneous character remains unaltered, and the only means of separating its elements is another chemical operation.

Mr. Farges endows primordial matter with the following properties: indestructibility, simplicity of essence, identity in all material substances, passivity, quantitativeness, impenetrability, need of a substantial form.¹²

Primordial matter is indestructible, and cannot cease to exist unless it be annihilated by an act of Divine Omnipotence.

It is simple as regards its essence, but essentially multiple in its parts. It is the cause of the extension and divisibility of bodies; it is the principle of quantity.

¹² Cf. Farges, *Matière et Forme*, 2. Partie, p. 143 ff.

It is identical in all material substances, which, as we have seen, are distinguished from one another by means of the substantial form. Primordial matter is therefore the principle of all that which is common to all material substances, namely extension, divisibility, impenetrability, quantity, etc.

In all objects, it constitutes the passive principle, the principle of inertia, whereas the substantial form is the principle of activity.

Finally, primordial matter, not being able to exist in a state of isolation, stands, by the same fact, in need of a substantial form. Still, matter does not join itself indistinctly to any kind of form, but has a special aptitude to choose the form which suits it best. And we are thus led to the theory of the hierarchy of forms, corresponding to the various degrees of perfection and development in primordial matter.

"The more elevated in the hierarchy of beings the form is," says Farges, "the more must matter be prepared by a series of intermediate forms, which gradually dispose and elevate it. And this is true in the order of physico-chemical phenomena as well as in the biological order. And in no case could disproportionate elements be united, as, for example, a human soul with the organism of an ape."¹³

Thus far we have spoken of primordial matter in a general way, without taking into account the various divisions given by Scholastic philosophers, both in the Middle Ages and in our own day. We do not think these divisions indispensable to a thorough comprehension of the theory, and neo-Scholastics are unanimous in considering many of them as useless subtleties. We cannot, however, abstain from enumerating the most important among them, and we feel confident that such an enumeration will give a more comprehensive view of Scholastic thought, and easily make us understand the drift of that teaching.

The first division which suggests itself is that of primordial and secondary matter.

¹³ Farges, *Matière et Forme*, p. 147.

Secondary matter is the complete material substance modifiable by accidents, as, for example, any chemical substance. Primordial matter is the incomplete material substance which, actuated by the substantial form, produces a complete corporeal substance.¹⁴

We can easily see by these definitions that primordial matter alone is matter strictly speaking. The so-called secondary matter is any material object as it exists in nature, after having been actuated by the substantial form: it is matter as understood by the plain man, but it must be carefully distinguished from the *materia prima* of the schoolmen.

Another well-known division of matter is the *out of which*, the *in which*, and the *about which*.

Primordial matter is *out of which* relatively to the complete substance, or to the substantial form which is educed from it. The body of a brute, for example, is the matter out of which its soul is evolved.

Primordial matter is *in which* with regard to the substantial form considered as united with it, and forming with it a complete substance. In this sense, the body of a brute is the matter in which its soul exists in a state of indissoluble union.

Finally, primordial matter is *about which* with regard to the efficient cause by whose action it is produced. The body of a brute is thus the matter about which generation is concerned.

Matter out of which has also been subdivided into passing and persistent matter. Thus, the matter of the wood submitted to the action of the fire is passing; while the matter of the wood used by the carpenter to manufacture a piece of furniture is persistent.¹⁵ Not only is this subdivision of little account, but it seems to be based upon a wrong interpretation of the terms, inasmuch as primordial matter is persistent in both cases, and that which is really passing is the substantial form.

¹⁴ Cf. Ginebra, *Elementos de Filosofia*, Vol. 1, p. 200.

¹⁵ Cf. Harper, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 188.

But the divisions of matter which show Mediaeval subtlety at its best are to be found in Duns Scotus.

A singular view on this subject had already appeared in the eleventh century. The celebrated Jewish philosopher, Ibn Gabirol, had advanced in his principal work, *Fons Vitæ*, a startling theory of universal matter, according to which all substances, spiritual as well as material, were to be regarded as composed of matter and form.¹⁶ This strange doctrine was later on adopted by some Christian writers and became one of the leading characteristics of the Franciscan school.

Almost two centuries after the death of Ibn Gabirol, the first Franciscan teacher of theology in the University of Paris, Alexander of Hales, expressly taught in his *Summa Theologiae* that spiritual substances are composed of matter "quæ nec est subiecta motui nec contrarietati."¹⁷ The same view was maintained by St. Bonaventure,¹⁸ and also by Duns Scotus:

"Ego autem ad positionem Avicembronii redeo; et primam partem, scilicet quod in omnibus creatis per se subsistentibus tam corporalibus quam spiritualibus sit una materia, teneo, sicut ostensi in præcedenti questione."¹⁹

With that distinguishing subtlety which forms the essential characteristic of his philosophy, Duns Scotus introduces a new division of the *materia prima*. He divides it into *materia primo-prima*, *materia secundo-prima*, and *materia tertio-prima*.

The *materia primo-prima*, or *materia metaphysica*, seems to be identical with the universal matter of Ibn Gabirol and of the Franciscan teachers. It is absolutely indeterminate and exists in all beings, incorporeal as well as corporeal.

The *materia secundo-prima*, or *materia mathematica*, is defined as the subject of generation and corruption:

¹⁶ *Fons Vitæ*, V, 21.

¹⁷ Cf. Turner, *History of Philosophy*, p. 327.

¹⁸ In 2. Sent., Dis. 3, P. 1, art. 1.

¹⁹ Duns Scotus, *De Rerum Principio*, Q. 8, art. 4; *Opera*, Vol. 4, p. 378.

“ Est subjectum generationis et corruptionis, quam mutant agentia creata, seu Angeli seu agentia corruptibilia.”²⁰

The *materia tertio-prima* is defined as the matter of any particular natural agent:

“ Dicitur autem materia tertio-prima materia cujuscunque artis, et materia cujuslibet agentis naturalis particularis, quia omne tale agit veluti de aliquo semine, quod quamvis materia prima sit respectu omnium, quæ per artem producuntur, supponit tamen materiam, quæ est subjectum generationis, et ulterius aliquam formam per naturam productam, aliter nulla ars quidquam operatur.”²¹

To sum up in a few words:

The *materia primo-prima*, or metaphysical matter, constitutes the passive principle of all finite beings, spiritual as well as material.

The *materia secundo-prima* is the passive principle of corporeal substances only, and is called mathematical because it is the base of extension and quantity.

The *materia tertio-prima* is the matter of the plain man, and does not differ from what we have elsewhere termed secondary matter.

SECTION 3.—NATURE AND PROPERTIES OF THE SUBSTANTIAL FORM

Contrasted with primordial matter, or the passive principle of all things, there is in them all an active principle called substantial form. It is the form that causes all beings to be what they are, that ranges them in determinate species. Unlike matter, it is not the same everywhere, but is found with a greater or less degree of perfection according to the excellence of the being it constitutes. There is therefore a countless multitude of substantial forms correlative to the multiplicity of things.

²⁰ Duns Scotus, De Rerum Principio, Q. 8, art. 3.

²¹ *Ibid.*, *ibid.*

Inorganic bodies possess forms of the lowest order, and we reach more perfect forms as we ascend in the scale of beings. In the vegetable kingdom, the form is the vegetative soul, also called the principle of life: in animals, it is the sensitive soul, far more perfect, material however and doomed to perish with the animal frame to which it is joined. In man, the substantial form is the spiritual soul, which is, by its nature, intrinsically independent of matter, and cannot be affected by the death of the body. Although changeable in its operations and capable of development, it is, as to its essence, absolutely immutable and, by consequence, destined to continue in existence throughout all eternity.

Besides the substantial form, Scholastics admit accidental forms which, like color, figure, etc., are accidents which modify the complete substance.

In the foregoing section, we have already hinted at some of the properties of the substantial form. We have spoken of the hierarchy of forms, corresponding to the various degrees of perfection in primordial matter. We have also seen that, whereas matter is in all things the passive principle, the substantial form is the principle of activity:

“The first essential attribute of the form is to be the principle and the source of the activity or energy which we find in corporeal substances, now in potency, now in actual operation.”²²

Of the remaining properties of the substantial form, the most important are the following two: its simplicity, and its need of primordial matter.

The latter may have been easily inferred from the exposition given in the preceding section. Like primordial matter, the substantial form does not and cannot exist by itself in nature:

“The material form has an innate need, and, if such a figure be allowed, a natural desire, ‘*appetitus naturalis*’ for matter, because, according to the will of the Creator, it cannot exist

²² Farges, *Matière et Forme*, p. 126.

without that natural complement which gives it a body, a definite place and a sensible expression.”²³

About this unisolable character of the substantial form perfect unanimity does not, however, exist among the schoolmen. All Scholastics are unanimous in maintaining that the form is essentially joined to the matter in all corporeal things; but whether the same holds true of spiritual beings is a very controverted question. We have seen how Duns Scotus, following Ibn Gabirol and the Franciscan school, attributes matter to all beings, and terms *materia primo-prima* what might be described as immaterial matter.

The great majority of Scholastic philosophers reject Duns Scotus's theory on this point, and affirm with St. Thomas that, in spiritual beings, form exists without matter. But as, according to St. Thomas, matter, and not form, is the principle of individuation, it follows that there cannot exist two angels of the same species. St. Thomas unequivocally admits the inference:

“Si ergo angeli non sunt compositi ex materia, et forma, ut dictum est supra, sequitur quod impossibile sit, esse duos angelos unius speciei: sicut etiam impossibile esset dicere, quod essent plures albedines separatæ, aut plures humanitates, cum albedines non sint plures, nisi secundum quod sunt in pluribus substantiis.”²⁴

This deduction might lead us to conclude that, at the death of the body, human souls will be deprived of the principle that made them separate individuals and will be one and the same. Such a conclusion would either overthrow St. Thomas's theological view of eternal life, or be a *reductio ad absurdum* of his theory of form. But he meets the objection with a most remarkable subtlety by saying that the souls of men will ever remain distinct, because, although they will be separated from their material frames, they will still retain a certain *habitus*

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

²⁴ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Pars 1, Q. 50, art. 4, c.

ad corpus which will be sufficient to distinguish them from other souls.

The remaining property of the substantial form is its simplicity. It has been remarked that primordial matter, although it is the principle of quantity and divisibility, possesses a certain simplicity. It is simple in its essence and essentially multiple in its parts. The substantial form is likewise simple in its essence, but, unlike primordial matter, it is endowed with simplicity as regards its parts.

On this point an explanation seems, however, indispensable. All material beings fall under two great classes: they are either organic or inorganic. An organic being is admitted by all Scholastics to be really one; hence it possesses but one form; but inorganic beings are not endowed with the same character of unity. They are merely aggregates of simple parts, called molecules or atoms, each of which has its own individual existence. It is therefore to the molecule or to the atom that the simplicity of form belongs.

Simplicity of form understood in this manner has been unanimously accepted in the school; but a certain number of philosophers have thought it necessary to admit in organic beings some subordinate forms destined, not to destroy the simplicity which the substantial form possesses, but to give more consistency to some points which, in the ordinary Scholastic doctrine, seemed to be inconsistent.

The doctrine of the plurality of forms was maintained by Henry of Ghent. He admitted in man, besides the rational soul, a subordinate form, which he named *forma corporeitatis* or *mixture*, and to which he attributed the function of causing the great variety of our organs and the substantial organization of matter. He proved its existence by the following argument:

“Aliter enim nihil homo in generatione hominis generaret substantiale, sed tantummodo corrumpere.”²⁵

²⁵ Quodlibet, III, 16. Cf. Turner, History of Philosophy, p. 385.

This *forma corporeitatis* was said to exist in the embryo before the appearance of the spiritual soul, and to continue to exist in the body after death, until decomposition takes place.

Not long afterwards the same doctrine was rendered famous by Duns Scotus. This subtle thinker maintained that the substantial form determines matter to a mode of being, but does not determine it perfectly, and leaves in it a certain potentiality, or aptitude for a higher form. And when matter arrives at the possession of this higher form, the inferior form continues to be present; so that, the more perfect the matter is, the greater the plurality of forms with which it is endowed.²⁶

The same view appeared, in a more or less modified form, in later Scholastic thought. Lessius, Conninck, Mayr and others admitted in animals a certain number of partial forms, which they called forms of the bones, of the flesh, of the eyes, etc. They similarly spoke of the forms of leaves and roots in plants. However, the great majority of Scholastics, following St. Thomas, teach that living organisms cannot possess more than one substantial form. They assert that the *forma corporeitatis* is impossible and unnecessary.

It is impossible because if it were a substantial form animating the body before the appearance of the spiritual soul, as its supporters maintain, the spiritual soul, inasmuch as it would thus be united to a substance already complete, could not be a substantial, but only an accidental form.

It is unnecessary, because, according to Scholastic philosophy, a form of a higher order gives to the matter to which it is joined not only the characteristic properties it possesses by its nature, but also all properties belonging to the forms of a lower order. Our spiritual soul, for instance, gives us not only spiritual faculties, but also the sensitive faculties of the brute and the vegetative life of the plant.²⁷

This exposition of the theory of the substantial form demands

²⁶ Cf. Duns Scotus, *De Rerum principio*, Q. 8, art. 4.

²⁷ Cf. Urraburu, *Compendium Philosophiæ Scholasticæ*, Vol. 4, pp. 29 ff.

as a complement a few words about a formula often met with in Scholastic treatises: *Forma educitur e potentia materiæ*.

With the exception of the human soul, all substantial forms are intrinsically dependent on matter, and, for this reason, are called material. Still, they do not exist in matter actually, but potentially; for otherwise changes would be only accidental, not substantial. These forms are not created, inasmuch as creation is the production of a being from nothing, and substantial forms are produced out of preëxisting matter. Now, observing what occurs in substantial changes, we see that, in order that the change may take place, it must be accompanied by some determinate conditions. On the appearance of these conditions a new substance is produced. This mode of production is what Scholastics call education out of the potency of matter.²⁸ The spiritual soul alone is not educed in this manner. Being by its nature spiritual, it is intrinsically independent of the body and is created immediately by God.

SECTION 4.—MODERN SCIENCE AND THE CONSTITUTION OF MATTER

It is only with the greatest reserve that one can enter on discussing the constitution of matter. So many brilliant minds have grappled with this stupendous problem, only to give up its solution in despair, that many think it a mere waste of time to try to drag Nature's secret from her pent-up bosom.

Such a proceeding, however, is but the position of despair and can hardly be justified.

Any existing thing can be understood, because to understand (*intus legere*) is to know a thing as it is, to read its most intimate nature. It is not meant by this assertion that, in our actual condition, we can be omniscient. Things which do not fall within the sphere of our experience will forever remain unknown to us; but, in the constitution of this material world,

²⁸ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *De Potentia*, Q. 3, art. 8.

there is apparently nothing lying beyond the grasp of our intellectual powers. An adequate explanation of the constitution of matter does not therefore seem an impossibility, although we frankly admit that it has not been yet reached, and we doubt whether our triumph on this point will ever be complete.

It has always seemed to us that Dynamism is somewhat fanciful, and the relatively small number of followers it has gained among men of science cannot but confirm us in the same view.

According to P. G. Tait,²⁹ the most fatal objection to which it is exposed is that it is incapable of explaining inertia, a distinctive—perhaps the most distinctive—property of matter. This remark is not absolutely devoid of value, as the manner in which Dynamism accounts for inertia seems rather arbitrary. Still, we do not think that Tait does full justice to his opponents' view, nor can it be maintained that the dynamic explanation of inertia is altogether valueless.

According to Dynamism, nothing exists in nature but centers of force, whose essence is to act. The action of one of these centers will be prevented from producing its natural effect if it is counteracted by the resistance of another force of equal and opposite value. And thus the state of equilibrium will arise and will be a mode of tension. Inertia is thus explained in this system not by the absence, but by the equilibrium of forces.

A greater deficiency of Dynamism is perhaps its incapability of explaining extension. The centers of force it admits in nature are unextended. By being conglomerated in countless numbers, they give rise to an apparent, illusory extension, in the same way as points, placed side by side, may lead us to believe in their forming continuous letters.

The comparison just given, first proposed by Boscovich himself, simply ignores the difficulty. Points placed side by side may lead us to believe in their forming continuous letters, provided each of them possesses a certain extension. If the points are altogether unextended; if, as regards extension, each one is

²⁹ Cf. Tait, *Properties of Matter*, p. 20.

nothing, their sum will also be nothing, and no illusion of continuous letters will be possible. This is precisely what takes place in Boscovich's system. His centers of force either are in contact with one another or they are not. If they are, they co-penetrate one another, and there is no extension. If they are not—besides the fact that the so-called heresy of distance action is then involved—we have a series of points, none of which has extension; and as each one, in so far as extension is concerned, is thus nothing; as between them there is only void space, which is equally nothing, we cannot conceive how from the union of those countless nothings a something—even as an illusion—can arise.

The atomistic theory presents likewise a large number of difficulties that baffle our powers of observation and reasoning and leave us face to face with the dreadful sight of our utter insignificance. Mere atoms in the universe of matter, we took pride in our intellectual omnipotence. We looked on the towns we had built, the rivers we had spanned, the oceans we had crossed. We saw with delight thunder and lightning yield to our caprice. We then called ourselves the kings and lords of Nature. Undeceive thyself, O man! thy body is but an atom and thy mind is powerless. The lowliest fact of nature is for thee a mystery, and the more thou shalt study, the more clearly shalt thou see that ignorance is thy destined lot.

Ancient Atomism admitted nothing but atoms and void space. In order to avoid the assumption of distance action, the hypothesis of a fluid called ether was subsequently introduced. A mere hypothesis at first, when invoked to explain only the phenomena of light, the theory of ether was strengthened almost indefinitely when Clerk Maxwell showed that the phenomena of the electromagnetic field can be explained by an ether identical in nature with the luminiferous medium.

The great discovery of the English scientist was still further confirmed by the experiments of Hertz, who detected the existence and measured the speed of the electro-magnetic waves, thus

laying the foundation upon which the edifice of wireless telegraphy has recently been erected.³⁰

There seems thus not to be the slightest doubt as to the existence of ether. But, if we advance one step further and try to investigate its inherent constitution, we will find ourselves involved in darkness and condemned to nescience.

Some physicists have regarded ether as composed of minute particles, of a sort of atoms, infinitesimal in comparison with those of ordinary matter, but still atoms. This view was held by Lord Kelvin, by Whetham,³¹ and taken as the current ether theory by Herbert Spencer, who gave it as a proof of the unknowable character of the reality which surrounds us in nature.³² The same view has been defended in February, 1907, by Mr. Véronnet, in the *Revue de Philosophie*. These are Mr. Véronnet's words:

"The electrical theory obliges us to reduce matter and its phenomena to a system of attractive and repulsive central forces, called electrons. These forces are obliged to act at distance, inasmuch as they are found in the atomic or granulous state. They form discontinuous centers, and ether itself is constituted by them."³³

It is clear that, as an explanation of distance action, ether, thus understood, simply shifts the question. If it is composed of minute particles, these either must be separated by absolute void, and we are thus brought back to our starting-point, or they demand a second ether to explain the first, and we must admit an infinity of similar fluids, of which each and all are absolutely valueless as an interpretation of distance action.

The opposite view, more generally maintained nowadays, is that ether is not composed of atoms separated by void space, but is itself absolutely continuous. This conception is repeat-

³⁰ Cf. Whetham, *Recent Development of Physical Science*, p. 270.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 292.

³² Cf. Spencer, *First Principles*, Pt. 1, Chap. 3, sect. 18.

³³ La matière, les ions, les électrons: *Rev. de Philos.*, 1907, p. 156.

edly expressed by Joseph Larmor, in his famous work: *Æther and Matter*:

“All that is known (or perhaps need be known) of the æther itself may be formulated as a scheme of differential equations defining the properties of a continuum in space, which it would be gratuitous to further explain by any complication of structure.”³⁴

The same conception is also entertained by Sir Oliver Lodge, who sums up in the following words his own view on the subject:

“As far as we know, it (ether) appears to be a perfectly homogeneous incompressible continuous body, incapable of being resolved into simpler elements, or atoms; it is, in fact, continuous, not molecular.”³⁵

Now, is this second view in any way more satisfactory than the first? Our knowledge of nature shows us that the essential difference existing between solids, liquids and gases, is due to the greater or less degree of continuity of their structural particles. In the gaseous state a molecule freely passes from one molecular system into another. A diminution of temperature lessens the vibratory motion of the molecules, which are then reduced to a definite system, and are limited in their motion by the molecules surrounding them. The result is the liquid state. A further decrease of temperature draws the molecules still nearer to one another. Each one enters the sphere of action of the others, losing thereby the possibility of translatory movement, and becoming limited to orbital motion. A material object becomes therefore more and more solid in proportion as its continuity increases. If ether be perfectly continuous, it must be incomparably more solid than any other object. That this is not the case is almost an evident truth, inasmuch as if ether were endowed with such a degree of solidity, it is inconceivable how movement in it would be possible.

³⁴ *Larmor, Æther and Matter*, p. 78.

³⁵ *Lodge, Modern Views of Electricity*, p. 396.

Modern physicists reply to this objection by saying that we must not conceive ether as an ordinary material substance: "The properties of æther, says Sir Oliver Lodge, must be somewhat different from those of ordinary matter."³⁶ We doubt whether this remark will seem convincing. Ether is either material, or it is not. If it is material, it must be, like matter, composed of particles—either continuous or discrete—and the laws which apply to matter in general must apply to it also. If, on the other hand, it is not material, it is inconceivable that it may act upon matter, or be a connecting-link between atoms.

Whatever may be the view we accept as to the nature of ether, we are thus facing enigmas whose solution seems to be far beyond the reach of our present knowledge and to be destined to be a puzzle to human thought for many a future generation.

Let us not, however, conclude from these remarks that our knowledge of nature has not been increased by science. Although the unknown still exists, positive results have been obtained, especially in these last years, to such an extent that we may seem justified in the hope that what is still mysterious for us will be revealed to the rising generation.

The first great step toward an actual knowledge of matter was made by John Dalton. He revived the hypothesis of atoms to explain the fact that the elements of a compound combine in definite proportions, and suggested that these proportions represent the relative weight of the atoms.

As the atomic weights of many elements were found to be multiples of that of hydrogen, Prout supposed that the atom of hydrogen was the ultimate basis from which all substances were made. This suggestion, however, implied that the equivalents of all substances should be integers, which was not confirmed by experience, and Prout's view was forcibly abandoned. Such was still the situation when, in 1897, J. J. Thomson detected, in the cathode rays of a vacuum tube, corpuscles about one thousand times smaller than the atom of hydrogen. These cor-

³⁶ Lodge, *op. cit.*, p. 396.

puscles were shown to be identical whatever might be the nature of the tube or of the gas it contained. Vast was the field opened to science by this astounding revelation. The newly-discovered corpuscles were found to be atoms of electricity, were called electrons, and recognized as the long-sought-for ultimate basis of matter, as the sub-atoms which, grouped in various ways, give rise to the chemical atoms of all material objects.

The existence of the electrons has been repeatedly evidenced by experience, and it has received a strong confirmation by the recent discovery of radio-active substances.

The first observations on radio-activity were made by Becquerel, who, in 1896, discovered that compounds of uranium affect photographic plates through an opaque covering. The labors of Mr. and Mrs. Curie, of Mr. Rutherford, and other distinguished men of science, have thrown the desired light on the subject.

It is now well known that uranium, radium, thorium, and a few other metals constantly emit three types of rays, known as the α , β , and γ rays. The β rays have been most successfully studied, and are known to consist of negative corpuscles, or electrons, projected with the velocity of light. The α rays have been shown to consist of positively charged bodies, projected with a velocity of about one tenth of the velocity of light. The γ rays are the only ones whose nature is not yet fully known. The results of experience incline us to believe that they are analogous to Röntgen rays and consist of wave-pulses traveling through ether with incredible velocity.

The study of radio-active substances has also made known the fact that not only atoms are divisible and composed of electrons, but that real changes take place in the atoms themselves, by a process of disintegration, followed by a regrouping of the electrons, and that new substances thus arise from elements chemically simple.

From uranium and thorium products have been obtained, considerably more active than those metals themselves. To these

new substances the names of uranium-X and thorium-X have been given. But further observation has shown that these highly active products little by little lose their activity, and that the metals from which they were obtained regain at the same time the energy they had temporarily lost.

These interesting phenomena have been explained by the fact that all radio-active substances have high atomic weights, are therefore of a great complexity, and thus very instable. They constantly undergo a process of disintegration of which their radio-activity is the result. One or more particles are detached from the atom, and the atomic equilibrium is thus momentarily lost. Finally, the electrons arrange themselves differently, attain a new temporary equilibrium, and give rise to the substances known as thorium-X and uranium-X.

No doubt is therefore to be entertained as to the real changes that take place in the atoms themselves. And these changes bring to our minds the possible realization of the dreams of the Mediæval alchemists, at which, for so long a time, we have been wont to smile. If the atom is a complex structure which, on the occurrence of certain conditions, is disintegrable, there is nothing absolutely impossible in the transmutation of one metal into another. The only question is to bring about the conditions which the atomic disintegration necessitates. Do such conditions exist for all chemical elements? We are not inclined to believe it, but their existence is not an impossibility, and the hope of the Mediæval alchemist was not so preposterous as we have been taught to believe.

The facts which modern science may look upon as established truths are the following:

All substances, physically considered, are composed of molecules, which may be termed physical units, contain one or more chemical atoms, and, by their incessant motion, give rise to heat and other physical phenomena.

The molecules are composed of atoms, or chemical units, which, by their regrouping in different manners, give rise to the

various compound substances and are indivisible by chemical processes.

Finally, these atoms are nothing but groups of ultimate units, or electrons, which are the same for all substances, and, by their arrangement in different ways, form the simple elements which, until recently, had been believed ultimate.

The recent views as to the structure of the atoms, which we have briefly described, present a certain likeness to the Scholastic theory of matter and form. This theory, by means of some modifications, might even be brought into perfect harmony with these scientific results.

The modifications I have in view are the following:

Let us call primordial matter the mass of electrical units, or electrons, which have been shown to be the ultimate groundwork out of which all material elements are built.

Let us call substantial form the different arrangements of these ultimate units, to which the variety of material substances is due.

Primordial Matter will thus be the same in all things. The diversity of nature of the various substances will be due to the substantial form.

Our theory will be more in harmony with the spirit of Aristotle, who, in explaining matter and form by means of brass and a statue, implies that it is a real entity, and not an abstraction, that he has in view.

All the facts upon which the Scholastic doctrine of matter and form is based will be satisfactorily explained. The stability of quantity under all modifications of bodily substances will be accounted for by the fact that the ultimate units, although arranged in different ways, are still present in the same number.

As for the hypothesis of substantial changes in chemical combinations, it must be frankly abandoned. The atom of water must not be regarded as a homogeneous substance, but as a mere juxtaposition of two atoms of hydrogen and one of oxygen. The permanence of the elements in the compound is universally

admitted by chemists to-day. It is involved in the electron theory and has received a new confirmation from the phenomena connected with radio-activity. A study of the compounds of radio-active metals has shown that the rate of emission of the radiations depends only on the quantity of the element present, and is not affected by the amount of inactive substance which the compound contains. It is thus made clear that in a metallic compound we have not a substance composed of homogeneous atoms, but that the very atoms of the simple elements are juxtaposed and form new molecules. To Farges's objection that, in the case of a mere juxtaposition, the dissolvents of the simple elements should be effective, we will answer that dissolution is a physical—not a chemical—process, that dissolvents can act only on physical units or molecules, and that the atoms which, by their juxtaposition, form these molecules, being chemical units, are separable only by chemical processes.

CHAPTER V

SCHOLASTIC PSYCHOLOGY

SECTION 1.—THEORY OF ABSTRACTION

Experimental Psychology is a new-born science still seeking its definite path. After numerous hesitations and partial failures, it has come to the conviction that its true aim is not to supplant the old metaphysical psychology, but to walk side by side in the most peaceable manner. Experimental psychologists know full well to-day that the worth of the results they will obtain will be inversely proportional to the metaphysical preoccupations they cherish. Wiser than their older brethren, they limit themselves to measuring on the skin of the forehead the degree of fatigue produced by an intellectual work, and abstain from all hypotheses concerning the materiality or the spirituality of the mind.

Metaphysical psychology enjoys therefore an independent existence. It remains a branch of philosophy, whereas its younger sister is a positive science.

Scholastic psychologists adhere to Aristotle's definition of the soul: "*Anima est actus primus corporis physici organici, potentia vitam habentis*," regard the soul as the substantial form of the body, and maintain that it is essentially simple, spiritual and immortal.

Their proofs of the spirituality and of the immortality of the soul will find their place at the end of the present chapter. Before we expound them, it is necessary to discuss a question which may be said to lie at the very foundation of Scholastic psychology: the question of abstraction.

The theory which regards the mind as capable of abstracting from all particular determinations and of forming general ideas

has received in modern times many severe blows. The celebrated British philosopher, George Berkeley, regards the overthrow of that theory as a necessary presupposition of his system. In the Introduction to his *Principles of Human Knowledge*, he gives, in a somewhat joecose fashion, a minute account of what he understands by abstraction. He tells us, for example, that, by the abstract idea of body is meant "body without any particular shape or figure, without covering, either of hair, or feathers, or scales, etc., nor yet naked: hair, feathers, scales and nakedness being the distinguishing properties of particular animals, and for that reason, left out of the abstract idea."¹ He thereupon confesses that he cannot, by any effort of thought, conceive the abstract idea thus described. His conclusion is that an abstract general idea is an absurdity and that the only ideas we are entitled to regard as general are particular ideas which are made to represent or stand for all other particular ideas of the same sort.²

Berkeley's rejection of abstraction rests upon a lamentable confusion which has originated in Locke and pervaded the whole body of modern philosophy: the confusion of the two terms Phantasm and Idea.

A writer who feels little sympathy for the schoolmen, John Stuart Mill, confesses that they were unrivalled in the construction of technical language, and that their definitions have seldom been altered but to be spoiled.³ Nowhere perhaps does his remark apply more justly than in the present case.

A phantasm is the imaginary representation of a particular object previously perceived. It is a kind of mental picture which reproduces more or less faithfully what we have experienced in the past. Besides the power of reproduction, we possess the faculty of combining the objects of our previous experience in an infinite variety of forms. Now an imposing

¹ Fraser's Selections from Berkeley, p. 13.

² *Ibid.*, p. 17.

³ J. S. Mill, *System of Logic*, Bk. 1, chap. 2, sect. 4.

structure we have admired during the day is present to our mind. We endeavor to reproduce it faithfully, to reconstruct one by one its minutest details. One moment has elapsed and our imagination is wandering in the most capricious fashion. Horace's monster sits triumphingly on the ruins of the monument so carefully constructed in the previous instant, and which has now crumbled to pieces and disappeared forever with the instant of time which brought it forth. The range of our imagining power is thus unlimited. Each one of our mental pictures, however, represents one single particular object. However blurred may be the image, however indefinite its features, it is always singular. I cannot form a mental picture of a triangle without giving it a definite size and shape, by which it becomes one individual, distinguishable from all other possible triangles.

It is to the phantasm thus described, and improperly called idea, that Berkeley's criticisms apply. That ideas of this sort cannot be abstract goes without saying. No triangle can be imagined that is not either scalene, isosceles or equilateral; no body that is not either covered or naked. But it is not an idea of this sort that the great masters of Scholasticism considered as the product of abstraction.

Besides the power of reproducing and combining our past sensations—a power we possess in common with the lower animals—there exists in us a faculty of conceiving the universal as such, of forming true ideas.

The idea, which, to avoid all confusion, it would perhaps be better to call concept, is no mental picture whatever. It is a notion of our mind, the knowledge of what something is. We know that a triangle is a geometrical figure consisting of three sides and three angles. This knowledge is the idea of the triangle. It is clear and distinct, and is also universal, inasmuch as it applies to all triangles we may happen to conceive. It is an abstract idea, because it is not limited, like the phantasm, to one particular object, but may be truly predicated of a

whole class. The essential characteristics which separate it from the phantasm may be reduced to the following three:

1. The idea is one. The idea of a triangle is one and the same for all possible triangles. The phantasm, on the contrary, is multiple. The imaginary picture of a right triangle is unlike that of a scalene triangle.

2. The idea is universal, inasmuch as we predicate it of all existing and possible objects of a class; the phantasm is singular and concrete, because it applies to a determinate object and to no other.

3. The idea is necessary and immutable. The elements of the concept of a triangle are invariably three sides and three angles. The phantasm is mutable and contingent. It changes as rapidly as the objects which present themselves to our senses.*

The confusion we have thus described may be readily accounted for. Our intelligence cannot easily operate without its concomitant phantasm. Although a reasoning about a triangle might be effected without the help of a sensible image, it could not be but at the cost of the most strenuous mental efforts. This is the reason why text-books on geometry exhibit sensible images side by side with the demonstrations. It is the reason why Loeke and the whole British empirical school have been led to a confusion which even such a clear-minded man as Berkeley has been unable to detect.

One of the most interesting pastimes of a scholar is the perusal of the works of the great masters of human thought with the purpose of reading between their lines what they themselves have not read, of deducing from their principles the logical consequences they have not deduced. Berkeley in particular may offer us some delicious hours of entertainment. Talented as he was, he could not but recognize that the conceptions of our minds are not copies of sensible impressions, that the ideas of God and of the soul are not mere reproductions of the data of sense-experience. Unwilling, however, to give up

* Cf. Ginebra, *Elementos de Filosofia*, Vol. 2, p. 73.

his theory of ideas, he thought he could save his position by using the word notion :

“ So far as I can see,” said he, “ will, soul, spirit, do not stand for different ideas, or in truth for any idea at all, but for something which is very different from ideas, and which, being an Agent, cannot be like unto, or represented by, any idea whatsoever. Though it must be owned at the same time that we have some notion of soul, spirit, and the operations of the mind, such as willing, loving, hating, inasmuch as we know or understand the meaning of these words.”⁵

We must confess that in these few lines the author of the *Principles* utterly overthrows the elaborate controversy of his Introduction. Let him call his idea phantasm and his notion idea, and his agreement with us will be absolutely perfect. He has thus proved that an abstract phantasm is an impossibility, which we readily grant him. He has proved nothing against the Scholastic doctrine of abstraction, and would even probably admit with us that his notions of soul and spirit are truly general, and that they apply to all existing spirits or souls.

Closely related to the theory of phantasms and ideas, is the division of our mental faculties into organic and inorganic.

Organic faculties are those we possess in common with the lower animals. In their nature and operations, they depend upon our bodily organs. Such are the imagination and the sensitive memory. Inorganic faculties, on the other hand, depend upon the soul alone. They are essentially spiritual, and would continue to exist and to operate if our mind were separated from its bodily frame.

Upon this classification of our mental powers is based the essential distinction maintained by Scholastics between men and brutes. Lower animals possess only organic faculties. They can form phantasms, but no ideas. They never reach the universal because they lack intelligence, by which alone the universal is reached.

⁵ Berkeley, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

SECTION 2.—NATURE OF THE HUMAN SOUL

Scholastic philosophers regard the soul as the substantial form of the body, from which it is intrinsically independent, though united with it in a manner characterized as substantial and personal.

By the intrinsical independence of the body is meant that the soul is an activity by itself, that it is not determined by material conditions, and hence that it will continue to exist and to exercise its operations after the death of the body.

By the substantial and personal union is meant: (a) that the human compound is a substance by itself; and (b) that man is the compound, and not the soul alone. The nature of this union is very clearly expressed by St. Thomas in the following formula: "In each one of us, by the soul and body, is constituted a double unity, of nature and of person," "*ex anima et corpore, constituitur in unoquoque nostrum duplex unitas, naturæ et personæ.*"^a

The doctrine of intrinsical independence separates Scholastic philosophy from materialism. The doctrine of substantial and personal union sets it apart from the dualistic systems of Plato and Descartes, which regards man as a spirit accidentally united with the body, and governing it as the pilot governs his vessel.

The human soul is further described as possessing the three characteristics of simplicity, spirituality and immortality.

The proofs of the simplicity of the human soul may be condensed in the following form: The nature of a being is known from its operations. The operations of the soul are essentially simple. Hence the soul itself is by nature essentially simple.

Examples of simple operations of the soul may be adduced and multiplied at will. There are the simple ideas of being, truth, virtue and the like, which cannot, by any effort of thought, be conceived as divisible. There are the intellectual acts of judgment, which presuppose a simple subject and can hardly be explained in any other hypothesis. If the mind

^a Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, P. 3, q. 2, art. 1, ad 2.

which apprehends the subject and the predicate is not one and indivisible, we have no judgment whatever, but merely two different impressions without any possible connection. Kant was perfectly aware of this truth when he formulated at the basis of his philosophy the principle that experience by itself furnishes only detached and unconnected facts, and that no judgment is possible without a mental synthesis.

The doctrine of the simplicity of the soul has been attacked by David Hume in a most ingenious manner. He describes it as a true atheism, capable of justifying all those sentiments for which Spinoza is "so universally infamous."

"There are in my experience," says he, "two different systems of being, to which I suppose myself under a necessity of assigning some substance, or ground of inhesion. I observe first the universe of objects or of body: the sun, moon and stars; the earth, seas, plants, animals, men, ships, houses, and other productions either of art or nature. Here Spinoza appears, and tells me that these are only modifications; and that the subject, in which they inhere, is simple, uncompounded, and indivisible. After this I consider the other system of beings, viz., the universe of thought, or my impressions and ideas. There I observe another sun, moon and stars; an earth, and seas, covered and inhabited by plants and animals; towns, houses, mountains, rivers; and in short everything I can discover or conceive in the first system. Upon my enquiry concerning these, Theologians present themselves, and tell me, that these are also modifications, and modifications of one simple, uncompounded, and indivisible substance. Immediately upon which I am deafened with the noise of a hundred voices, that treat the first hypothesis with detestation and scorn, and the second, with applause and veneration. I turn my attention to these hypotheses to see what may be the reason of so great a partiality, and find that they have the same fault of being unintelligible, and that as far as we can understand them, they are so much alike, that it is impossible to discover any absurdity in one, which is not common to both of them. We have no idea of any quality in an object, which does not agree to, and may not represent a quality in an impression; and that because all our ideas are derived from our impressions. We can never, therefore, find any repug-

nance betwixt an extended object as a modification, and a single uncompounded essence, as its substance, unless that repugnance takes place equally betwixt the perception or impression of that extended object, and the same uncompounded essence. Every idea of a quality in an object passes through an impression; and therefore every perceivable relation, whether of connexion or repugnance, must be common both to objects and impressions.”⁷

The objection so clearly exposed by Hume, and which, from his own point of view, seems unanswerable, loses much of its force if we bear in mind the distinction pointed out above between ideas and phantasms. The phantasm, being a copy of a previous impression, is no doubt composed of parts, just as well as the impression is. If I picture in my mind the frontispiece of Columbia University, ten different columns stand there before me, the length of each of which may be divided into two parts; and these may again be subdivided at least as easily as the real columns could be. I believe everybody would agree with Hume on this point; but such are not the operations from which the simplicity of the soul is deduced. The sun, moon and stars Hume describes as existing in his universe of thought are as truly multiple as those of the universe of nature. The rivers he imagines are made of drops of water, the trees of branches and leaves. But the conclusion to which he is led by these considerations, his conviction that the soul is not simple, but divisible like the universe of matter; is that conviction divisible also? Can it be mentally cut into two parts, two half-convictions; or, similar to the river, is it made up of an infinite number of drops of conviction? These are, however, the absurdities from which we cannot escape if we are unwilling to admit the essentially simple character of intellectual ideas.

A great number of concepts, it is true, are in a certain sense divisible. Upon their divisibility is based the Scholastic division of concepts into simple and complex. Complex concepts are made up of several simple elements. The concept of

⁷ Hume, *Treatise on Human Nature*, Selby-Bigge's ed., pp. 242-243.

man, for example, may be resolved into the elements of animal and rational. This sort of division is, however, quite different from that of material beings, or of their reproduction in our mind. The red surface I see or imagine may be divided into two red surfaces, identical in nature with the first, and differing from it only in quantity. The elements of the concept of man are of an entirely diverse order. They are not merely two halves of a whole. They differ from each other and from the whole in quality, and the entire process of division rests upon their specific differences. But as qualitative division cannot, like quantitative division, be continued *ad infinitum*, we must finally arrive at essentially simple concepts, and conclude that they are produced by an essentially simple being.

The questions of the simplicity and of the spirituality of the soul, although closely connected, must be carefully distinguished. Every spiritual being is simple; but a simple being is not necessarily spiritual. Scholastic text-books give as an instance of a simple, non-spiritual being the soul of the lower animals, which depends upon the body in all its operations, comes into existence with the body, and ceases to be as soon as the body dies.

The spirituality of the human soul may be defined as its intrinsic independence of matter. In virtue of that independence, it is not affected by the death of our organism, it does not disappear with our last breath. When this mortal life of ours comes to an end, our spirit springs forth; and, free from material bonds, starts a new and purer life, a life that shall know no death.

The spirituality of the soul is proved from the nature of its faculties: the intelligence and the will. These faculties have for objects the universal and the necessary. It is to the universal as such, to a nature conceived with an absolute—not an individual—character, that our intelligence tends. It studies the essence of the object, abstracting from the individual characteristics of “this” object. A peculiar aspect of

the universal is its necessity. This necessity, human intelligence does not fail to grasp. It directs its efforts to the immutable aspects of things, and abstracts from the contingent character they possess as individuals.

Our will likewise tends to the universal manifested in the form of the absolute good. No limited and relative good can satisfy us. It is in the union with an absolute perfection that our will would rest, that it would find its perfect happiness.

Now, these characters of universality and necessity unequivocally separate our mental faculties from the pure forces of matter. Matter is essentially individual, and envelops in individual conditions all objects of which it is an essential constituent. Our mental faculties are thus independent of matter, and the soul, the substance they constitute, is necessarily endowed with the same independence.⁸

Several other arguments of lesser importance are adduced to confirm the same view. The act of self-consciousness, for example, is said to separate the soul from all material agents; for, whereas matter can act upon itself only in the sense that a certain particle can act upon another particle, the human mind can and does reflect upon itself in such a manner that the Ego reflecting and the Ego reflected upon are one and the same.⁹

A third proof very much insisted upon is deduced from the contrast between the effects produced upon the intellect and the senses by their respective objects. When the excellence of the object of sense increases beyond a certain limit, the organ undergoes corruption, and is eventually destroyed. A vivid light impairs our eye-sight; a prolonged contemplation of the sun may result in blindness. Our intellect, on the contrary, becomes keener and more penetrating when the object it ponders becomes more sublime.

The characteristics which separate sense from intellect are reduced by Urraburu to the following six:

⁸ Cf. Gardair, *La Nature Humaine*, pp. 169 ff.

⁹ Maher, *Psychology*, 3d ed., pp. 452 ff.

1. (Which is essential and the root of the others.) Intellect is an inorganic or spiritual faculty; sense is organic and material.

2. Sense is found in all animals; intellect only in rational animals or men.

3. Sense knows only the singular; intellect knows the universal.

4. Sense extends only to material objects; intellect to immaterial objects as well.

5. No sense knows itself or its own operation; the intellect knows itself and its operation.

6. The senses are corrupted by the excellence of the sensible object; the intellect remains uncorrupted, however excellent its object may be.¹⁰

The remaining property of the soul, its immortality, follows from the previous two as a logical consequence. The soul, being essentially simple, cannot, like the body, perish by dissolution of parts; and, on the other hand, being spiritual, having its peculiar, independent life, not being conditioned in its existence and operations by the bodily organism, it cannot cease to exist simply because the organism is destroyed. The theological belief in another life is thus not only shown to harmonize with reason, but is deduced from the fundamental principles of philosophy. Whether human reason can likewise prove the eternity of this new life, is considered a debatable question. Maher, in his *Psychology*, answers it negatively. As a theologian, he believes in eternal life; as a philosopher, although he sees no reason why the soul should ever perish, he admits that "leaving Revelation aside and arguing solely from reason, he does not see any perfectly demonstrable proof of the everlasting existence of human souls." "Almighty God," adds he, "could by an exercise of His absolute power, annihilate the human soul as well as any other object which He has created."¹¹

¹⁰ Cf. Urraburu, *Compendium Philosophiæ Scholasticæ*, Vol. 4, p. 240.

¹¹ Maher, *op. cit.*, p. 486. The same view is also maintained by Meurin, *Ethics*, p. 161.

I believe that most neo-Scholastics would disagree with Fr. Maher on this point. They would be inclined to maintain that the human soul can be proved, not only to endure for a certain time after death, but to endure forever. This view is clearly exposed and defended in the works of Urraburu. Starting from the ordinary arguments of the school, the learned Jesuit demonstrates that the soul cannot perish like the body by a natural death, and he reaches Maher's conclusion that the soul can cease to exist only through an act of annihilation of an all-powerful God. But, whereas Maher stops at this point, and leaves human reason uncertain whether God will destroy or not the spirit he has created, Urraburu shows that such an annihilation would involve an inconsistency in God's own nature. His argument may be outlined as follows: God has constituted the human soul in such a way that it is naturally immortal. If he should choose to destroy it by an act of his will, there would be a contradiction between the creative act by which he gave the soul an immortal nature and the destructive fiat which would reduce it to nothingness. As no such contradiction can be supposed in an absolutely perfect being, the soul will exist forever. Urraburu corroborates his teaching by the authority of St. Thomas. The annihilation of the soul would be a miracle, and a miracle never takes place except as a manifestation of God's glory. But, St. Thomas says, "*redigere aliquid in nihilum non pertinet ad gratiæ manifestationem, cum magis per hoc divina potentia et bonitas ostendatur, quod res in esse conservetur.*"¹²

SECTION 3.—LOCUS OF THE HUMAN SOUL

The title of this section suggests a venerable formula, frequently derided nowadays and more frequently misunderstood, the famous *Tota in toto, et tota in qualibet parte*, which has been recently pronounced "disconcerting but to the chosen few who

¹² Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, P. 1, Q. 104, art. 4, c. Cf. Urraburu, *op. cit.*, pp. 656 ff.

have embraced a philosophy of contradictions, and rejoice in the absurdity of the conclusions to which their reasonings conduct them."

The words I have just quoted are from Mr. Fullerton. In a chapter of his *System of Metaphysics*, entitled "The Atomic Self," he exposes the semi-materialistic opinion of the plain man about mind, and traces it back to the philosophies of the most ancient times. He holds that the teachings of those old systems have become incorporated into theology and ethics, have left their traces upon language and literature, have become a part of the common thought of the human race, and are now accepted by the great mass of men as self-evident truths.

"Ancient philosophers believed the mind to be material and unequivocally in the body. It was composed of fine round atoms, highly movable atoms, etc. It could be inhaled and exhaled, and might escape through a gaping wound, as wine spouts through the rent wine-skin. It was a kind of matter and nothing more, having the same right to occupy space that has any other form of matter. Afterward it was for centuries still in the body, but in a much more indefinite and inconsistent fashion. It was wholly in the whole body, and wholly in every part."¹³

The Scholastic formula is thus regarded by Fullerton as the direct offspring of old materialism. It is materialism still, although somewhat transfigured. It is materialism aware of its inner incongruity, and trying to save its own life by means of vague subterfuges. The mind is still located in the body, but its presence there is regarded as immaterial. Descartes who emphasized the presence, but neglected its immaterial character, located the soul in the pineal gland. The scholastics emphasize both sides of the inconsistent doctrine. They "stir up the contradiction and make it growl, striking fear to the heart of the beholder."

Fullerton's doctrine on the locus of the soul is identical with Hume's. Although we differ from the author of the *Treatise*

¹³ G. S. Fullerton, *System of Metaphysics*, p. 267.

on Human Nature in many essential points, we cannot but fully agree with him here, and even regard his teaching as irrefutable. Location in a determinate place is a property of material beings, and has no sense except if applied to such. The chair upon which I am sitting is said to be located between the walls of my room in so far as it can give rise to tactual and visual impressions spatially related to the impressions caused by the walls themselves. When we assert that the point *A* is between *B* and *C*, we mean that a line going from *B* to *C* would pass through *A*. Location in space, thus applied to material beings, is perfectly intelligible; but, as Hume and Fullerton maintain, it loses all meaning if predicated of mind. It sounds nonsensical to assert that a thought is placed between a desk and a blackboard, that ten different volitions are actually crossing the street; but if we express the same idea in different words, if we say that the human mind is placed in a certain portion of our organism or in our whole body, the absurdity of the assertion becomes less apparent and may be easily overlooked. It exists, nevertheless, and to say that our mind is located in our body, or that God is located everywhere—if we take the word located in its proper meaning—is no less preposterous than to say that a benevolent desire took the ferry-boat, and was slowly carried from New York to Brooklyn.

Where is our mind then? And where is God? Such questions cannot be answered but in the following way: Our mind is nowhere, and God is nowhere. The “where” implying parts outside of parts, and being a property of matter alone, cannot be predicated of immaterial things. And if it sounds odd to say that spirits are nowhere, it is because we are so immersed in material thinking that we cannot believe that a thing can exist without material relations. The existence of our mind is an immediate fact of consciousness. It is an ultimate fact upon which all our knowledge is grounded, and which itself needs no proof. It is the center from which we have to start in our investigations concerning reality. But the relations which our

mind bears to the rest of the universe cannot be assimilated to the relations of particles of matter. We fully agree with Hume and Fullerton that a philosophical system tending to localize mind in a definite portion of space must be rejected as absurd.

What becomes of the Scholastic formula then? Must we, without more ado, regard it as the outcome of an illogical materialistic conception of an immaterial thing? Some powerful motives at once come forth and give to this view the greatest uncertainty. St. Thomas's doctrine of the soul, inspired by Christian theology, is more decidedly immaterialistic than the theories of Locke, Hume, and the whole British empirical school. For whereas sensism resolves ideas into sense-impressions and admits only a difference of degree between sense and intellect, St. Thomas and the schoolmen maintain that the difference is not of degree but of kind, that between the sensuous impression and the intellectual thought there is an impassable chasm. How strange would it sound then that he who might be described as the foremost adversary of materialism, should himself fall into the very errors he constantly opposes!

A careful study of the doctrines of St. Thomas suffices to absolve him from all charges of materialism. The Angelic Doctor not only did not intend to localize the mind in a definite portion of space, but he was as fully aware as Hume of the evident truth that position in space is a property of matter and of matter alone.

In the *Summa contra Gentiles*, St. Thomas examines how an intellectual substance can be united to the body, and teaches that there are two kinds of contact: a contact through quantity, which is proper to material beings alone, and a contact through virtue, which may belong to immaterial beings as well. This latter kind is however described as contact only metaphorically. A spirit is said to touch only in so far as it acts, only in the sense in which we are entitled to say that a sad news touches us:

“ Si igitur sint aliqua tangencia quæ in quantitatis ultimis

non tangerent, dicentur nihilominus tangere, in quantum agunt; secundum quem modum dicimus, quod contristans nos tangit.”¹⁴

Further on, the Christian teaching of God’s ubiquity compels St. Thomas to take up the same question again. And now as before, his teaching is unmistakably clear:

“Res autem incorporea in aliquo esse dicitur secundum contactum virtutis, quum careat dimensiva quantitate. Sic igitur se habet res incorporea ad hoc quod sit in aliquo per virtutem suam, sicut se habet res corporea ad hoc quod sit in aliquo per quantitatem dimensionam. Si autem esset aliquod corpus habens quantitatem dimensionam infinitam, oporteret illud esse ubique. Ergo, si sit aliqua res incorporea habens virtutem infinitam, oportet quod sit ubique. Est igitur ubique.”¹⁵

We thus see that, in St. Thomas’s view, the words: God is everywhere, simply mean that he acts upon all beings. We also see that the presence of the soul in the body must not be regarded as a material presence. It is not in the body as the blood is in our veins. Properly speaking, it is not in the body at all. It simply acts upon the body, and touches it as a piece of bad news touches our heart. The formula: *Tota in toto et tota in aliqua parte*, thus understood, loses all its material flavor. Instead of appearing as a nonsensical collection of words, worthy of derision and scorn, it steps forth as a flash of genius, as a profound truth which commands our admiration and our assent.

¹⁴ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles*, Lib. 2, chap. 56.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Lib. 3, cap. 68.

CHAPTER VI

SCHOLASTIC NATURAL THEOLOGY

SECTION 1.—NATURAL AND REVEALED THEOLOGY

The very title, Natural Theology, suggests that some other kind of theology exists. And, indeed, Scholastics have always carefully distinguished between natural and revealed theology. This is one of the points which unmistakably separate the Scholastic system from the philosophy of the Hegelian school. According to Hegel and his disciples, no truth lies beyond the reach of the human mind. God is an object of experience as clearly present to our natural faculties as tables and chairs. An adequate knowledge of the Absolute is thus perfectly possible, and theology becomes a branch of philosophy.

St. Thomas and the Scholastics, on the other hand, believe that the Divine Essence cannot be known by our finite minds. Our natural faculties may lead us to the knowledge of God's existence; they may even enable us to reach a true knowledge of his nature; but, as this knowledge is not reached by direct intuition, but by the consideration of the finite world in which we live, it cannot be adequate.

As the imperfect knowledge of God our mind can attain may be supplemented by the Divine Revelation, the science of theology is evidently twofold: Natural Theology deals with the knowledge of God human reason can attain by its natural forces; Revealed Theology deals with the knowledge of God which lies beyond the reach of our natural faculties and is attainable only by revelation. The philosopher is thus concerned with natural theology; he has nothing to do with revealed theology.

SECTION 2.—PROOFS OF GOD'S EXISTENCE

All possible proofs of the existence of the Divine Mind may be classified under three heads:

1. The *a priori* proof, derived from the very concept of God, and usually known as ontological argument.

2. The *a posteriori* proofs, by which we ascend from the knowledge of the finite world to the knowledge of the infinite.

3. The moral arguments, drawn from the nature and aspirations of the human heart; also, from the common consent of mankind.

The ontological argument has never enjoyed much favor among Scholastic philosophers. First proposed by Anselm of Canterbury and at once assailed by Gaunilo the monk, it has been discussed and finally rejected by Thomas Aquinas. Accepted in a slightly modified form by Descartes and Leibniz, it has been rejected again by Kant and readmitted by Hegel, who believed that since its first formulation until the time of Kant it had been unanimously accepted among philosophers.¹

These repeated attempts to rehabilitate the fallen argument have been a decided failure. Neo-Scholastics to-day regard the ontological proof as worthless, and, in so doing, are perfectly justified. The weak point of the argument has been clearly pointed out by Thomas Aquinas.² Anselm's reasoning unduly passes from the ideal to the real order. The conception of the most perfect being must include the element of existence, as Anselm believed; but this existence must be ideal, limited to the concept of our mind, and cannot legitimately be predicated of the objective world.

The argument from the moral law has been repeatedly formulated and defended. All men, it has been said, believe in the existence of a moral law. They all regard some actions as praiseworthy, others as condemnable. Now, without God, a

¹ Cf. Hegel, *History of Philosophy*, pp. 62 and 64.

² Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, P. 1, Q. 2, art. 1; C. G., Lib. 1, cap. 11.

moral law would be an absurdity, because the very notion of a law implies the existence of a legislator, endowed with a sufficient authority to impose it and give it a sanction.

Is this line of reasoning defensible? We are not inclined to believe it. The fact that some acts are universally praised as good, while others are universally condemned, may be sufficiently explained from the nature of the acts themselves without any necessity of a recourse to a supreme Lawgiver. There is no doubt that if God exists, he is the foundation and the source of all truth, and therefore the ultimate ground of the moral law; but, as his existence is precisely in question, it is from the human acts themselves that we must start. As no mathematician needs to postulate a Divine Being in order to understand that the sum of the angles of a triangle has been universally believed to be equal to two right angles, so the moralist needs no God to account for the fact that incontinence is universally regarded as degrading and courage as praiseworthy. The very results of our acts give us the clue as to their moral character. Scholastic philosophers are thus right when they refuse to assign to the argument from the moral law a primary importance.

Another moral argument, altogether different from the one we have presently considered, is derived from the common consent of mankind. Like all moral arguments, the argument from universal consent is regarded by Scholastics as of secondary importance. It is, however, defended as legitimate, and invariably finds a place in treatises on natural theology. The fact itself that all peoples have believed in a Supreme Being seems to admit of no reasonable doubt. To Spencer's objection that the savage's concepts of God have been evolved out of ghosts or ancestor-spirits, and, with the evolution of human ideas, have gradually acquired a nobler form, Scholastics answer that the conceptions of God found among savage or semi-civilized nations are corruptions of a purer and older form, and that the tendency of mankind is thus to fall away from a primitive

monotheism.³ Whether this theory can be maintained nowadays, I will not here discuss. I will limit myself to remarking that it is far from rendering the argument from universal consent unassailable. This argument even becomes valueless if we take into account the fact, attested by the Biblical relation and generally admitted to-day by natural science, that all men have come from a single stem. The force of the argument lies in the fact that a notion of the Deity is found among all tribes of men, and must thus be due to human nature itself, inasmuch as an error or a fraud might have crept among one particular nation, but could not possess a universal character. Now if all men had a common origin, if there was at the beginning a single family, it may be perfectly well supposed that an erroneous notion has been accepted by this family, and, transmitted to its posterity, has become a universal error of the human race.

The arguments we have described as *a posteriori* are especially insisted upon by St. Thomas and his modern followers. These arguments invariably start from the knowledge of the world given in experience, and rise to the knowledge of God. They assume different forms, which may be reduced to the two we shall presently expose.

The first is sometimes described as "physical argument." It starts from the order of the world, the perfect adaptation of means to ends which we find around us, and concludes that such an adaptation evidently points to the existence of a supreme Designer. Absolutely speaking, a casual shock of atoms might indeed have produced the world such as it is, just as printing characters, thrown at random, might give the play of Hamlet, but the chance for such a production is so insignificant that it may be neglected.

This argument has received a severe blow from Darwin's theory of natural selection. It is even contended that it has been absolutely killed. It is morally impossible that the paw of the cat, so perfectly adapted to the catching of the prey,

³ Cf. Driscoll, *God*, pp. 29 ff.

should have been produced by a casual shock of atoms, just as it is morally impossible that printing types, thrown at random, should give the play of Hamlet. But, if we adopt the theory of natural selection; if we admit that the types which happen to fall in the definite place they have in the play shall persist in existence while the others shall disappear, the play of Hamlet will fatally be produced.

We should be cautious, however, not to assert too hastily that the argument from design has been absolutely killed. The hypothesis of natural selection explains the order of the world without taking a supreme Designer into account. But what of natural selection itself? How are we to explain the tendency of the atoms towards definite arrangements, the fact that some arrangements persist in existence while others are destroyed? Instead of the innate tendency of the atoms towards definite groups, why was there not a tendency towards a perpetual chaos? A chaotic cosmos seems indeed the only possible outcome of a mere shock of atoms, and the hypothesis of natural selection is a nonsense if we do not admit finality. All the perfections of the future world must thus be supposed to exist potentially in the originary chaos, and the necessity of a designer by no means disappears.

The metaphysical argument is based upon the principle of causality. The fact that no beginning of existence can happen without a cause has been proved in our chapter on metaphysics and needs not be insisted upon. In the metaphysical argument, the form of the principle of causality is somewhat modified. "Whatever does not exist of absolute necessity, it is contended, cannot exist without a proportionate cause."⁴ Which means that the cause, considered in its totality, must contain a perfection at least equal to that of the effect. The validity of this form of the principle of causality might perhaps be questioned. It is strongly defended by neo-Scholastics, who contend that if the cause failed to be proportionate, the excess of the effect

⁴ Boedder, *Natural Theology*, p. 33.

would really be without cause, and the general law of causality would be thereby violated.⁵

The necessity of a proportionate cause being admitted, the existence of a Supreme Mind follows as a necessary consequence. A clear idea of the Scholastic line of reasoning may be gathered from the following three propositions in which the argument may be summed up:

1. *There are changes in our world, and these changes presuppose a cause.* The truth of this first proposition has been clearly shown in our chapter on metaphysics.

2. *These changes presuppose a self-existing cause.* If the cause of the changes is not self-existing, it must be caused by something else. This something else, if not self-existing, must also be caused, and we must finally arrive at a self-existing being; otherwise we would have an infinite process, and no change would be possible, inasmuch as a sufficient cause of the change could never be found. Thus far there is nothing in our argument which a materialist would fail to admit. A self-existing being exists, he would say, but we need not go beyond the molecule, the atom, the material world. The following proposition separates the Scholastic system from all materialistic hypotheses:

3. *This self-existing being must be an immaterial and free being.* The ultimate cause of the world must not simply be a cause; it must be a proportionate cause. The world contains immaterial and free beings, such as the human soul. Therefore the cause of the world must be an immaterial and free being, that is to say, a personal God.

SECTION 3.—ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

The Divine Being of the Scholastics possesses three fundamental attributes: he is infinite, one and simple.

The doctrine of an infinite God is not without difficulty. Some Catholic philosophers have thought that, although faith

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

obliges us to believe in the infinity of the Supreme Being, this infinity cannot strictly be proved by reason alone. In a recent article of the *Revue de Philosophie* (1906), Mr. Dessoulavy expressed his sympathy for Schiller's thesis on this subject. The modern followers of St. Thomas, however, strongly insist upon the capacity of philosophy to reach a knowledge of the infinity of God. They adopt the line of reasoning which led Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas to the concept of pure actuality (*actus purus*).

Every finite being, they argue, consists of actuality and potency: of actuality in so far as it possesses some perfections; of potency, in so far as it is capable of acquiring the perfections it does not possess. Now the actual is logically anterior to the potential, because a potential being cannot become actual unless it be acted upon by an actual being. The ultimate cause of reality must not therefore contain any potentiality; otherwise it would presuppose another cause and would not be ultimate. It must be pure actuality, and accordingly possess all perfections in an infinite degree.⁶

From the infinity of God follows his unity as a logical consequence. If there were several Gods, they should differ in some characteristics. Each of them would thus lack the peculiar perfections which characterize the others, and none could be infinite.⁷

The proof of God's simplicity rests upon his self-existence. Whatever is compound depends upon its constituent elements and upon the cause of their union. As God is the ultimate ground of all reality, he cannot depend upon anything else and must be absolutely simple.⁸

From these three fundamental attributes, all attributes of the

⁶ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, C. G., lib. 1, cap. 16; also Garrigou-Lagrange, *Le Dieu fini du Pragmatisme*, *Rev. des sci. philos. et theol.*, 1907, pp. 252 ff.

⁷ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, P. 1, Q. 11, art. 3.

⁸ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, P. 1, Q. 3, art. 7; Boedder, *Natural Theology*, p. 93.

Divine Being are derived. They are not all, however, established in the same way. As our intuitive knowledge is limited to finite beings, it is from these finite beings that we must rise to a conception of the infinite. Now the attributes of creatures are of several orders: some involve imperfection, others do not. The attributes which involve imperfection, such as extension, reason, etc., cannot be predicated of God who is infinitely perfect. Those which involve no imperfection, such as intelligence, power, etc., are properly in God. But whereas finite beings possess these attributes in a limited degree, God, in virtue of his infinity, possesses them as boundless and infinite.

The attributes of the Supreme Being may be therefore classified into negative and positive.

The negative attributes are immutability, eternity and immensity. They do not give us any real knowledge of God. They simply remove from the conception of the Infinite some imperfections attached to finite things. They do not show us what God is, but what he is not.

God's immutability is closely connected with his infinity. Whatever admits of change is not infinitely perfect. It lacks at some moment of its existence the perfections it subsequently acquires. It possesses some potentiality and is not, like the Divine Being, absolutely actual.

God's eternity can be proved in a similar way. When the Scholastics assert that God is eternal, they do not, as is sometimes supposed, simply mean that he had no beginning and shall know no end; they also remove from his conception the element of succession. They mean that there exists for him no past and no future; that his being is a perennial present.

We have already touched upon the question of God's immensity in our chapter on Psychology. We have shown that, in St. Thomas's view, the assertion that "God is everywhere" does not mean that he is present in all parts of space as bodies are. It means that he acts upon all things; that he is present in them by a contact of virtue, not by a contact of quantity.

The positive attributes of the Divine Being are his knowledge, his will, and his omnipotence.

God has a comprehensive knowledge of his essence, and in his own essence he sees the essences of all real and possible things. His knowledge extends to the contingent as well as to the necessary; and, inasmuch as he is eternal, to the future as well as to the past.

The faculty of will consisting in the love of the object presented by the intellect as good, involves no imperfection and must be found in the Supreme Being. God loves his own essence necessarily, because his essence is the supreme and infinite good, and is therefore worthy of an infinite love. His love for creatures is an outcome of the love he bears to himself. It is in his own essence that he knows all finite beings, of which his essence is the prototype. It is in his own essence that he loves all finite beings, the perfections and the goodness of which are found in his essence in an infinite degree.

God is also omnipotent. He can do by a single act of will whatever is not intrinsically impossible. As for things whose concept involves a contradiction—such as a square circle, or a man being an ass—it is only an improper use of the terms that leads us to assert that God cannot do them: it would be more correct to say that the things themselves cannot be done. They involve a contradiction, and the Infinite Being must above all be self-consistent. It is the same self-consistency that explains how God cannot possibly commit sinful acts. The essence of sin consisting, not precisely in the production of an effect, but in the opposition of our free will to the eternal law of God, its presence in the Divine Being would involve the denial of his own self.

The preceding classification of the attributes of God should not, however, lead us to believe that the Divine Essence is considered by Thomists as divided into separate and unconnected compartments. Hegel's reproach against the old Metaphysics,

of cutting off from their connection the terms of thought,⁹ is absolutely unjust if directed against Scholastic speculation. St. Thomas and his followers insist upon the physical and metaphysical simplicity of the Divine Being. We assign attributes to God, it is true; but we must not forget that these attributes, although different for us, are essentially one in God. God is his essence, or his nature;¹⁰ his essence is his own being;¹¹ his intellect his own being;¹² his will is also his own being.¹³ If we are compelled to study his attributes separately, it is on account of the imperfection of our mind, which, being essentially finite, cannot grasp the Infinite: "*Balbutiendo, ut possumus, excelsa Dei resonamus.*"¹⁴

⁹ Hegel, *Logic*, Wallace's ed., pp. 60 ff.

¹⁰ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, P. 1, Q. 3, art. 3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, P. 1, Q. 3, art. 4.

¹² *Ibid.*, P. 1, Q. 14, art. 4.

¹³ *Ibid.*, P. 1, Q. 19, art. 1.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, P. 1, Q. 4, art. 1, ad 1.

CHAPTER VII

SCHOLASTIC MORAL PHILOSOPHY

According to Mr. De Wulf, the essential characteristics of the Scholastic system of ethics may be reduced to two heads: it is eudemonistic and libertarian.

In order to form a clear conception of the nature of this eudemonism, a few considerations about the necessary conditions underlying the activity of all beings will not be out of place here.

Waiving all other considerations, it must be admitted that all agents act for a definite end. This is true not only of conscious beings, but likewise of inanimate objects. It follows as a necessary consequence from the fact that our cosmos presents us with distinct individuals, each of which is endowed with a peculiar nature. When dynamite blows up an edifice, it acts towards an end as well as the acorn when it becomes an oak. Like the acorn, it possesses an essential character, definite potentialities which, under proper conditions, will forcibly become actual. The only difference that exists between the potentiality of the inorganic and of the organic world lies in the fact that inorganic agents do not possess any principle of self-actuation, and therefore they do not act except when moved by some external cause. Organic beings, on the other hand, are endowed with an inner principle of self-determination. It is in this very principle that the essence of life consists: "The living being," says St. Thomas, "is the one that can move itself," "*Vita est substantia cui convenit secundum naturam suam movere seipsam.*"¹

Plants, however, although self-determined, are not conscious of the end toward which their own nature compels them to tend.

¹ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, P. 1, Q. 18, art. 2, c.

They are thus inferior to sentient beings, whose essential characteristic is a more or less clear consciousness of their own peculiar activities. Man alone possesses an intellectual knowledge of his end, because he is the only being endowed with reason and capable of forming universal concepts. He alone properly knows his end and can adopt the most suitable means to reach it. He alone is a moral being.

Ends may be divided into proximate and ultimate. Proximate ends are those that are not desired for themselves; but only in so far as they are steps towards the attaining of ultimate ends. Strictly speaking, they are not ends, but means. Ultimate ends are desired for their own sake and therefore they are not subservient to anything else. If we consider health as the ultimate end a sick man has in view—an end which cannot be ultimate for him in so far as he is a man, but only in so far as he is a sick man—the acquiring of the remedies which he is obliged to take in order to get rid of his disease will be a proximate end.

Proximate ends being thus properly means, an infinite series of such ends becomes absurd, and we must admit that rational beings not only act for an end, but for an ultimate end.

The great question of morality consists therefore in the determination of the ultimate end of man. All actions subservient to this end will be good; all actions inconsistent with this end will be bad. Now, if this world of ours is rational, we must admit that the end of all beings is true to their nature. It cannot be but the actualization of the potentialities they contain, the unfolding of the latent perfections which constitute their very essence.

This most important truth has been relegated to oblivion by all that put the foundation of morality on a mere external principle.

Whether we build our ethical system upon the common consent of mankind, as Saint-Lambert did, or upon the civil law, as Hobbes, or upon the will of God, as Crusius, we remove

rationality from our world, and, by so doing, we destroy morality itself. All external systems of ethics imply that no action is good or bad in itself; that an act we now regard as good would be bad if some determinate free agent had willed it so; might become bad this very day if the will or the caprice of the law-giver should vary. Under such conditions no science of ethics is possible.

The end of man is thus the complete actualization of his nature—or to use a term current in ancient Greece—perfect happiness.

Here Scholastic ethics meets a powerful adversary which, under a variety of forms, has controlled modern thought, has assumed different garbs according to the varying circumstances, and, repeatedly unmasked, has appeared again and again, its appearance being the signal for prolonged applause; a system which, under the specious names of hedonism, Epicurianism, utilitarianism, is to-day perhaps more vigorous than ever and prides itself upon its able defenders and legions of adherents.

The difference between hedonism and Scholasticism lies in this: Hedonism inculcates that pleasure is the ultimate criterion of morality, and that an action is good only in so far as it is pleasurable; whereas for Scholasticism goodness lies in the nature of the act itself, and pleasure is simply an effect which may follow from a moral act, which will necessarily accompany the good in the long run, but which is not the good.

As hedonists often allege the authority of Plato and Aristotle in support of their theory, it will be worth while, before exposing the prime defect of Hedonism, to quote a few passages which clearly show that Plato and Aristotle did not confuse the pleasurable with the good, and that furthermore they held, in regard to the final end of man, the very beliefs that characterize the ethical system of the Scholastics.

The first passage is taken from Plato's *Gorgias*:

"Listen to me, then, while I recapitulate the argument: Is the pleasant the same as the good? Not the same. Callicles

and I are agreed about that. And is the pleasant to be pursued for the sake of the good? or the good for the sake of the pleasant? The pleasant is to be pursued for the sake of the good. And that is the pleasant at the presence of which we are pleased, and that is good at the presence of which we are good? To be sure. And we are good, and all good things whatever are good when some virtue is present in them? That, Callicles, is my conviction. But the virtue of each thing whether body or soul, instrument or creature, when given to them in the best way, comes to them not by chance, but as the result of the order and truth and art which are imparted to them. Am I not right? I maintain that I am. . . . And is not the soul which has an order of her own better than that which has no order of her own? Certainly. And the soul which has an order is orderly? Of course. And that which is orderly is temperate? Assuredly. And the temperate soul is good? No other answer can I give, Callicles dear. . . . If the temperate soul is the good soul, the soul which is in the opposite condition, that is the foolish and intemperate is the bad soul.

“And will not the temperate man do what is proper, both in relation to gods and men; for he would not be temperate if he did not what is proper? Yes, certainly. And in his relation to other men he will do what is just, and in his relation to the gods he will do what is holy; and he who does what is just and holy cannot be other than just and holy? Very true. And he must be courageous, for the duty of a temperate man is not to follow or to avoid what he ought not, but what he ought, whether things, or men, or pleasures, or pains, and patiently to endure what he ought; and therefore, Callicles, the temperate man, being, as we have described, also just and courageous and holy, cannot be other than a perfectly good man, nor can the good man do otherwise than well and perfectly whatever he does; and he who does well must of necessity be happy and blessed, and the evil man who does evil miserable.”²

As we see, happiness is by no means identified with pleasure. It consists in a certain virtue, in an order which characterizes the soul of the good man. The temperate soul is the good soul; the foolish and intemperate is the bad soul.

² Plato, *Dialogues*, Jowett's ed., Vol. 3, pp. 97-98.

A similar doctrine is held by Aristotle. In the first book of his *Nicomachean Ethics*, he teaches that happiness is neither pleasure, nor honor, nor wealth, but "an energy of the soul according to virtue." These are Aristotle's own words:

"Men seem not unreasonably to form their notion of the good, and of happiness, from observing the different lives which men lead. The many and most sordid class suppose it to be pleasure, and therefore they are content with a life of enjoyment.³

"But, perhaps, to say that happiness is the greatest good, appears like stating something which is already granted; and it is desirable that we should explain still more clearly what it is. Perhaps, then, this may be done, if we take the peculiar work of man; for as to the musician, and statuary, and to every artist, and in short to all who have any work or course of action, the good and excellence of each appears to consist in their peculiar work; so would it appear to be with man, if there is any peculiar work belonging to him . . .

"What, then, must this peculiar work be? For life man appears to share in common with plants; but his peculiar work is the object of our inquiry: we must, therefore, separate the life of nutrition and growth. Then a kind of sensitive life would next follow; but this also he appears to enjoy in common with the horse, the ox, and every animal. There remains, therefore, a certain practical life of a being which possesses reason; and of this one part is, as it were, obedient to reason, the other as possessing it, and exercising intellect. But this life also being spoken in two ways (according to energy and according to habit), we must take that according to energy; for that appears to be more properly so called. Now if the work of man, and of a good man, is the same generically, as in the case of a harper, and a good harper (and so, in short, in all cases, superiority in each particular excellence being added to each particular work); for it is the work of a harper to play, of a good harper to play well: and if we assume the peculiar work of man to be a kind of life, and this life an energy of the soul and actions performed with reason; and the peculiar work of a good man to be the same things done well, and honorably; and everything to be complete according to its proper excellence:

³ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Bk. 1, chap. 5; Browne's ed., p. 7.

if, I repeat, these things are true, it follows, that man's chief good is "an energy of the soul according to virtue"; but if the virtues are more than one, according to the best and most perfect virtue; and besides this, we must add, in a perfect life: for as neither one swallow, nor one day, makes a spring; so neither does one day, nor a short time, make a man blessed and happy."⁴

Let us now directly examine hedonism itself.

In the first place, it sounds like a truism to say that the words "good" and "pleasurable" cannot be unqualifiedly taken as convertible terms. The common belief of mankind looks upon as good many actions that do not bring any real pleasure to their authors. The payment of a debt, charity to the poor, self-sacrifice, are praised all over the world. On the other hand, many acts bringing great pleasure are universally condemned. The drunkard and the libertine are objects of contempt to every right-thinking man.

Hedonists meet this objection by saying that the pleasure given as the basis of our conduct is not the particular pleasure of the moment, but the pleasure in the long run. The presently expected satisfaction is a worthy motive of action only in so far as it does not make impossible the attainment of a satisfaction more remote. Although in some particular cases, the pursuit of a proximate satisfaction is not to be considered as inferior to that of ultimate gratifications, it is none the less a fundamental principle that the guidance by simple and immediate feelings must be subordinated to the authority of higher and more complex feelings.

It cannot be denied that hedonism thus explained contains a great deal of truth. The egoistic element of all our acts must be frankly recognized. The poor workman who trods under foot his inordinate thirst for intoxicating liquor in order that his wife and children may have some bread to eat, relinquishes an immediate good to obtain a more distant good, the welfare

⁴ *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, chap. 7; Browne's ed., pp. 15-17.

and happiness of his family, and, as a consequence, his own peace and joy at home. The sister of charity, who leaves her home and parents, who renounces forever the most legitimate joys of life, the pleasures that the matrimonial state and the rearing of children would bring to her; who spends her days and her nights at the bedside of a poor sick man whom she has never met before, to whom she feels attached by no earthly bonds, whom nevertheless she attends with all the painstaking cares of a most devoted mother, whom she finally snatches from the claws of death, expecting no earthly reward, knowing full well that the only prize of her self-abnegation will be an untimely death; this sister of charity, whose whole life seems to be a glowing impersonation of altruism, is, from a hedonistic point of view, just as selfish as the most vulgar man. She renounces the pleasures of this world to enjoy the pleasures of the world to come. She abandons relatives, riches, life itself, all finite and perishable goods, to secure the possession of treasures that never fade nor grow old. The prize she covets is none less than God himself.

Pleasurable actions, however, can be made co-extensive with good actions only in assuming there is a future life. As many hedonists would be loath to take such a life into account, would rather profess with Hegel that this every-day world, what is here and now, has been a very good exchange for the shadowy other-world about which ancient philosophers worried themselves sick, there will come in their way a great many facts which their system—in the form we are at present considering—will be unable to explain. No future gratification, if we simply consider this actual world of ours, can possibly accrue to the soldier who, in a brave fight against the foes of his country, dies the death of a hero on the battlefield. If he is unknown to the world, he will not even reach the glory of having his name recorded in the annals of his country; he will not be held up to the school-boys of future generations as the ideal citizen. Obscure in life; still more obscure in death. No man, however,

would call into question the intrinsic worth of his heroic death.

Facts of this kind have caused the downfall of individual hedonism and given birth to the celebrated formula, so universally admitted by hedonists to-day: "the greatest good for the greatest number." In this new form of the system, not only must immediate satisfactions give way to satisfactions more remote, but the present and the future pleasures of the individual must be subordinated to the pleasures of the whole community. All forms of self-sacrifice are thus easily justified. The sister of charity will die in her prime of life at her post of duty, but the hundreds of unfortunate people whom she has rescued from death will live and society will be benefited. The hero will be killed on the battlefield, but his country will be saved.

Scholastic moralists would admit that pleasure and good are co-extensive. If good actions are those performed in harmony with our nature, they must needs produce pleasurable results at the present moment or at some future time. We cannot deny this principle without denying the rational character of our world. And as here below many deeds, universally regarded as good, do not give rise to any pleasurable consequence, there must exist a more perfect world, in which whatever seems irrational in this will be rectified. But, although pleasure and good are co-extensive, they are far from being identical terms. Pleasure bears to good the relation of an effect to its cause. A good action will produce pleasurable results; but it will produce them on account of its own inherent nature. The goodness will belong to the elements of the action itself, regardless of the consequences that may possibly follow from it. A ripe apple will give rise to pleasant gustatory impressions, but those impressions will be due to the peculiar nature and disposition of the atoms of the apple itself, which will thus possess an intrinsic goodness, independently of the sensations it may produce. And if the apple decays, it is in the apple itself that a change from good to bad will occur: it will be bad even if nobody ever tastes

it. What is true of an external object is likewise true of all that belongs to the inner nature of man. All our acts possess a value of their own, which must be regarded as primary, while the ensuing consequences are looked upon as only secondary. The good is thus identifiable with what is in harmony with our nature. But as we are endowed with several orders of faculties, as we are made up of body and soul, and thereby possess a sensuous and an intellectual appetite, the gratification of our lower impulses must be subordinated to our nobler energies. We must live according to our nature, but to our whole nature. The satisfaction of a sensuous desire is thus good in itself, but becomes bad if the exercise of a nobler faculty is thwarted thereby:

“Delectationes corporales,” says St. Thomas, “sunt secundum partem sensitivam, quæ regulatur ratione: et ideo indigent temperari et refrænari per rationem.”⁵

The assertion that the satisfaction of a sensuous desire is good in itself puts Scholastic moralists in conflict with the author of the *Critique of Practical Reason*. According to Immanuel Kant, a work is good when it is done, not only from duty, but from pure duty.⁶ Whenever some natural impulse furnishes the motive of a good deed, this deed is thereby deprived of its moral worth. Our actions must spring from duty alone, and not from any natural inclination whatsoever:

“To be beneficent when we can is a duty,” says Kant, “and besides this there are many minds so sympathetically constituted that, without any other motive of vanity or self-interest, they find a pleasure in spreading joy around them, and can take delight in the satisfaction of others so far as it is their own work. But I maintain that in such a case, an action of this kind, however proper, however amiable it may be, has nevertheless no true moral worth, but is on a level with other inclinations, *e. g.*, the inclination to honor, which, if it is happily

⁵ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, 1-2, Q. 31, art. 5, ad 3.

⁶ Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason* and other works, Abbott's ed., p. 23.

directed to that which is in fact of public utility and accordant with duty, and consequently honorable, deserves praise and encouragement, but not esteem. For the maxim lacks the moral import, namely, that such actions be done from duty, not from inclination.”⁷

Kant's system of morals, perfectly correct in so far as it recognizes that moral actions must spring from our own individuality, not from any external principle, correct also when it points out the insufficiency of hedonism, fails to recognize the legitimacy of our natural inclinations. Inconsistent when he divides our mind into two compartments, and sets the practical against the pure reason, the solitary of Koenigsberg is guilty of a similar inconsistency in his practical realm. He splits up, as it were, our intimate self, opposes one part to another, cherishes one fragment as genuine and praiseworthy, rejects the other as spurious and baneful. He prostrates himself before the categorical imperative, which indeed originates from the very depths of our soul, is God himself speaking to our heart and making us know our duties through the voice of our own nature; but, at the same time, he condemns, as adequate moral motives, those cravings, those natural aspirations which form, as well as the voice of pure duty, a constituent part of our own selves. His system, repulsive to the ordinary man for its barrenness, incongruous with the common beliefs of mankind in so far as it deprives of moral worth not only the charity of the good-natured man, but the sacrifice of the hero who dies for his country, is inadmissible in the world of thought because it makes man a mere bundle of contradictory elements.

The second characteristic of Scholastic ethics is its libertarianism.

The doctrine of free will has been so often misrepresented, and rejected on that account, that a few explanatory remarks will not be out of place here. It is quite absurd to call a free volition a causeless cause or a motiveless act. Libertarians are

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

far from teaching that free actions are done without a motive: they simply contend that the motive does not necessarily determine our will. Our will, they say, is a rational faculty whose object is the good. Now a good determines our will only if it is good in every respect. As long as there remains in it some undesirable aspect—as is the case with all the finite things of this world—our will has not what it naturally tends to, perfect happiness, and is not therefore necessarily determined:

“Si proponatur aliquod objectum voluntati, quod sit universaliter bonum, et secundum omnem considerationem, ex necessitate voluntas in illud tendit, si aliquid velit: non enim poterit velle oppositum: si autem proponatur sibi aliquid objectum, quod non secundum quamlibet considerationem sit bonum, non ex necessitate voluntas fertur in illud.”⁸

The laborer who, after toiling laboriously for long hours every day, brings his wife the fruit of his toil and fatigue instead of spending it in a grog-shop, certainly acts with an end in view. He is determined by a motive; but his own consciousness eloquently testifies that this motive did not determine his will necessarily, that he might have acted otherwise.

Scholastics are unanimous in regarding free will, thus understood, as an indispensable presupposition of all morality. The recognition of this truth does not belong solely to them. Kant, whose philosophy lies open to criticism in many other respects, joins here in perfect harmony with the teachings of the School. Free will has a conspicuous place in his system of ethics, is indeed its corner-stone. He regards it as an essential condition of all true morality.

If we start from fatalistic principles, if we regard all our acts as necessarily determined by our character and surroundings, all possibility of acting differently from what we did disappears, and the words merit and demerit lose all their significance.

It will perhaps seem strange that a philosophy professing to

⁸ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, I-2, Q. 10, art. 2, c.

be a revival of Thomism should defend any thesis of free will. Many non-Catholic writers, indeed, look upon St. Thomas as an angry determinist. We will limit ourselves to two quotations:

"In the first place," says Fullerton, "it may help one to realize how erroneous is the current notion that this doctrine (of free will) has some natural connection with religion and good morals, and that they may be expected to be found in conjunction. When Stoic and Epicurean are placed in contrast, it is certainly not to the advantage of the latter. And surely no man can regard Augustine as less religious than Pelagius, St. Thomas as less religious than Duns Scotus, Luther as less religious than Erasmus, and Jansenius as less religious than his Jesuit opponents. A glance at the history of human thought tempts one to maintain that men of strong religious feeling are less likely to become "free-willists" than other men. Their peculiar danger appears to be a lapse into some sort of fatalism."⁹

Our second quotation will be taken from the Swiss philosopher, Charles Secrétan:

"Il (St. Thomas) attribue la coulpe au libre arbitre de la volonté: 'Hoc enim imputatur alicui in culpam, quum deficit a perfecta actione cujus dominus est secundum voluntatem. . . . Deus est auctor mali pænæ, non autem mali culpæ.' Ces déclarations semblent précises, mais elles ne sauraient tenir devant le déterminisme absolu qui forme la base de tout le système."¹⁰

And a little further on he continues:

"Le libre arbitre n'est, aux yeux du dernier Père de l'Eglise, que la faculté de s'écarter de la raison. Il n'est donc pas question de libre arbitre en Dieu."¹¹

⁹ Fullerton, *System of Metaphysics*, p. 557.

¹⁰ Secrétan, *La Restauration du Thomisme*; *Rev. Philos.*, Vol. 18, p. 78.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 78. Let us compare with this last statement the following passage from St. Thomas's *Summa contra Gentiles*:

"Caput LXXXVIII: Quod in Deo est liberum arbitrium. Ex predictis autem ostendi potest, quod in Deo liberum arbitrium invenitur, nam liberum arbitrium dicitur respectu eorum quæ non necessitate quis vult, sed propria sponte; unde in nobis est liberum arbitrium respectu ejus quod volumus currere vel ambulare. Deus autem alia a se non ex necessitate vult, ut supra ostensum est. Deo igitur liberum arbitrium habere competit" (C. G., L. 1, c. 88). *Risum teneatis, amici?*

Sécrotan, however, does not feel perfectly at ease. He feels no doubt about St. Thomas's strict determinism. Nevertheless, he is compelled to recognize, in the works of the Angelic Doctor, some teachings sounding very much like an admission of free will. He concludes that a contradiction permeates the whole system :

“ En contradiction flagrante avec son déterminisme, avec son optimisme absolu, avec ses doctrines sur l'étendue de la causalité divine et sur la prescience de tous les futurs, Thomas professe catégoriquement le libre arbitre.”¹²

Let us now turn to the works of St. Thomas himself and see whether he would accept as his the doctrines thus imputed to him. We shall confine ourselves to a few striking passages, and refer those who should desire more abundant information to the *Summa Theologica*, the *Summa contra Gentiles* and the *Opuscula*, of which a thorough study is necessary for a complete understanding of the philosophy of St. Thomas, and in which the point which interests us at present is repeatedly and adequately discussed.

In the *Summa contra Gentiles*, St. Thomas teaches that all intellectual substances are endowed with free will :

“ Caput XLVIII.—Quod substantiæ intellectuales sunt liberi arbitrii in agendo. Ex his autem apparet, quod prædictæ substantiæ sunt liberi arbitrii in agendo. quod enim arbitrio agant, manifestum est eo quod per cognitionem intellectivam judicium habent de operandis. libertatem autem necesse est eas habere, si habent dominium sui actus, ut ostensum est (c. 47). Sunt igitur prædictæ substantiæ liberi arbitrii in agendo.”¹³

He gives his view on Divine Providence, and professes that it does not interfere with the free will of man :

“ Caput LXXIII.—Quod divina providentia non excludit arbitrii libertatem. Ex quo patet quod providentia divina vol-

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 82.

¹³ C. G., Lib. 2, c. 48.

untatis libertati non repugnat. . . . Per gubernationem ejus-
cumque providentis, res gubernatæ deducuntur ad finem con-
venientem; unde et de providentia divina Gregorius Nyssenus
dicit (De philos., l. 8, c. 2) quod est ‘voluntas Dei per quam
omnia quæ sunt convenientem deductionem accipiunt.’ Finis
autem ultimus ejuslibet creaturæ est ut consequatur divinam
similitudinem, sicut supra (c. 17) ostensum est. Esset igitur
providentiæ repugnans, si alieni rei subtraheretur illud, per
quod assequitur similitudinem divinam: agens autem volunta-
rium assequitur divinam similitudinem in hoc, quod libere agit:
ostensum est enim liberum arbitrium in Deo esse: non igitur
per providentiam prohibetur voluntatis libertas.”¹⁴

In the same chapter, he formally condemns the determinism
of the Stoics:

“Per hoc autem excluditur opinio Stoyeorum qui secundum
ordinem quendam causarum intransgressibilem, quem Græci
ymarmenen vocabant, omnia ex necessitate dicebant provenire.”¹⁵

In his *Summa Theologica*, his most perfect work, the fruit of
his maturer years, in which the thought of his whole life is con-
densed, the same truths are again and again enunciated. In the
83d chapter of the first part, he unequivocally admits free will
in man:

“Respondeo dicendum, quod homo est liberi arbitrii: alioquin
frustra essent consilia, exhortationes, præcepta, prohibitiones,
præmia, et pœnæ. Ad ejus evidentiam considerandum est,
quod quædam agunt absque judicio, sicut lapis movetur deor-
sum; et similiter omnia cognitione carentia. Quædam autem
agunt judicio, sed non libero, sicut animalia bruta. Judicat
enim ovis videns lupum, cum esse fugiendum, naturali judicio,
et non libero: quia non ex collatione, sed ex naturali instinctu
hoc judicat: et simile est de quolibet judicio brutorum anima-
lium. Sed homo agit judicio: quia per vim cognoscitivam judi-
cat, aliquid esse fugiendum, vel prosequendum. Sed quia judi-
cium istud non est ex naturali instinctu in particulari operabili,
sed ex collatione quadam rationis, ideo agit libero judicio, potens

¹⁴ C. G., Lib. 3, c. 73.

¹⁵ C. G., Lib. 3, c. 73.

in diversa ferri: ratio enim circa contingens habet viam ad opposita, ut patet in Dialecticis syllogismis, et Rhetoricis persuasionibus: particularia autem operabilia sunt quædam contingentia et ideo circa ea iudicium rationis ad diversa se habet, et non est determinatum ad unum. Et pro tanto necesse est, quod homo sit liberi arbitrii ex hoc ipso, quod rationalis est.”¹⁶

He even teaches that free acts are the only acts that may properly be styled human:

“Respondeo dicendum, quod actionum, quæ ab homine aguntur, illæ solæ proprie dicuntur humanæ, quæ sunt propriæ hominis inquantum est homo: differt autem homo ab irrationalibus creaturis in hoc, quod est suorum actuum dominus; unde illæ solæ actiones vocantur proprie humanæ, quarum homo est dominus; est autem homo dominus suorum actuum per rationem et voluntatem; unde et liberum arbitrium esse dicitur facultas voluntatis, et rationis; illæ ergo actiones proprie humanæ dicuntur, quæ ex voluntate deliberata procedunt: si quæ autem aliæ actiones homini convenient, possunt dici quidem hominis actiones, sed non proprie humanæ, cum non sint hominis, inquantum est homo.”¹⁷

He discusses the relations of God to man more closely still than in the *Summa contra Gentiles*, and reaches the same conclusions:

“Quia igitur voluntas est activum principium non determinatum ad unum, sed indifferenter se habens ad multa; sic Deus ipsam movet, quod non ex necessitate ad unum determinat, sed remanet motus ejus contingens, et non necessarius, nisi in his, ad quæ naturaliter movetur.”¹⁸

Therefore, there cannot be the slightest doubt as regards St. Thomas's libertarianism. It must be admitted, however, that a peculiar doctrine of his, universally accepted by his modern followers, seems, at first sight, to be hardly reconcilable with human liberty; it is the doctrine of prescience, predestination

¹⁶ *Summa Theol.*, P. i, Q. 83, art. 1, c.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1-2, Q. 1, art. 1, c.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1-2, Q. 10, art. 4, c.

and reprobation. St. Thomas asks whether men are predestinated by God, and he unreservedly answers that they are:

“Deo conveniens est homines prædestinare.”¹⁹

He adds that God reprobates some men;²⁰ that the elect are chosen by Him:

“Unde prædestinatio aliquorum in salutem eternam præsupponit secundum rationem, quod Deus illorum velit salutem. Ad quod pertinet electio, et dilectio”;²¹

that the number of the elect is certain not only formally, but materially; that is to say, God does not only know how many men will be saved; but he also knows whether John, Peter and Thomas will be saved:

“Respondeo dicendum, quod numerus prædestinatorum est certus. Sed quidam dixerunt, eum esse certum formaliter, sed non materialiter: ut puta, si diceremus certum esse, quod centum, vel mille salventur, non autem quod hi, vel illi. Sed hoc tollit certitudinem prædestinationis, de qua jam diximus. Et ideo oportet dicere, quod numerus prædestinatorum sit certus Deo non solum formaliter, sed etiam materialiter.”²²

It is thus clear that, according to this view of St. Thomas, God knows all future events; that, his knowledge being immutable, all things will necessarily come to pass as he actually knows them; that the number of the elect is thus determined; that God knows, with regard to any man, not only whether he will be saved or damned, but what the determination of his will will be in each particular case; that there is not the slightest possibility for any one of us to change in the least degree God's eternal and immutable decrees in our regard.

We do not deny that there is here an apparent clash with St. Thomas's teaching about free will. The opposition of the two

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 1-2, Q. 23, art. 1, c.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 1-2, Q. 23, art. 3.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 1-2, Q. 23, art. 4, c.

²² *Ibid.*, 1-2, Q. 23, art. 3, c.

doctrines, however, exists only in appearance, and disappears as soon as we grasp St. Thomas's conception of God. His theory of the Divine Being has been exposed in our chapter on Natural Theology. Suffice it to recall that God being eternal, there is no future for him, but a perpetual present. He has not existed through an infinite temporal series, a series of successive instants of which there was no beginning and which shall know no end; he even does not properly exist: He is. What is a future for us is thus not a future for God, and it is only an imperfection of our language that compels us to speak of God's prescience. He does not know our acts before we perform them; he knows them as actual. His knowledge is not logically anterior, but posterior to the free determination of our will. It is hard for us, of course, limited as we are to our temporal series, to have a clear conception of a knowledge of this kind. We may, however, have an idea of it—though imperfect—by considering our own knowledge of the present and of the past. We actually know that John has done this and Thomas that, and our knowledge does not interfere in the least with the freedom of their actions. It is in a similar way that God knows our future deeds. He knows them as done. He predestinates some men because they freely act in accordance with the moral law; he reprobates others because they freely disobey his precepts; he knows how many men will be saved just as we might know the exact number of soldiers who were slain at Gettysburg.

CHAPTER VIII

FORERUNNERS OF THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL

The causes which led to the downfall of Scholastic philosophy in the fifteenth century may be classified as internal and external.

Among the external causes the most important are :

1. The humanistic movement which, by bringing to light the literary beauties of the pagan classics, and insisting upon the form in which the thoughts were expressed rather than upon the thoughts themselves, was directly opposed to the spirit which had animated the schoolmen.

2. The rapid progress of natural science which, after having shown the insufficiency of the old physical system, extended its condemnation to the metaphysical principles with which this system was only accidentally connected.

3. The rise of Protestantism which, by its opposition to the Church of Rome, led to the rejection of the principle of authority and incited the minds of the new generation to deny or to question all that had been held sacred in the past.

4. The invention of printing, considered by Hauréau as the event which gave the death-blow to Scholastic metaphysics. During the thirteenth and fourteenth century, all instruction was forcibly oral, and the great centers of learning, in which Scholasticism predominated, were the only sources from which a philosophical instruction could be obtained. After the invention of printing, when books became of easy access, a course in the universities ceased to be indispensable, and a new philosophy, systematically opposed to the teachings of the schools, gradually found acceptance among the people.

The very supporters of Scholasticism contributed, however,

more than anything else, to discredit the system they were called to defend. The spirit which had animated the great masters of the thirteenth century had completely disappeared. Vain subtlety had replaced the profound reasoning of the past. The argument from authority, considered by St. Thomas as the weakest, had been raised to an undue importance. The new scientific spirit, into which the great Scholastics of the thirteenth century would have so eagerly entered, was opposed with unanimity by their degenerate successors. Instead of harmonizing their principles with the new physical discoveries, as Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas would have done, they opposed with all their might the very spirit of their time. They declared it to be opposed to the philosophical doctrines they cherished, and thus raised an unnecessary and unequal struggle, in which the old Metaphysics was doomed to perish.

Scholastic philosophy did not, however, completely disappear. An important movement of Thomistic revival took place during the sixteenth century and enriched Scholastic literature with many eminent contributions. Thomas de Vio Cajetanus (1469–1534), Vasquez (1551–1604), Toletus (1532–1596), Fonseca (1528–1599), and especially Suarez (1548–1617), were profound thinkers, worthy of the great masters whose principles they had adopted.

The influence exercised by the philosophy of St. Thomas during the seventeenth century was also considerable. Bossuet (1627–1704) and Fenelon (1651–1715), although controlled by Descartes to a certain extent, and sometimes regarded as Cartesians, developed a body of doctrines which is by no means opposed to the principles of the Angelic Doctor. Among the philosophical works of Bossuet, the *Traité de la connaissance de Dieu et de soi-même*, the *Logique* and the *Traité du libre arbitre* are of special significance. The philosophical doctrines they contain are evidently inspired by the teachings of St. Thomas.

Many writers of the same period were more strictly Thomistic

still. John of Saint-Thomas (1589-1644), Antoine Goudin (1639-1695), Cosmo Alemanni (1559-1634), Caramuel (1606-1682), Guerinois (1640-1703), may be counted among the most distinguished representatives of Scholasticism. Several of their works have been republished or studied during the present century.

During the eighteenth century, the philosophy of the schoolmen was gradually abandoned. The theories of Locke and Condillae found their way into many Catholic centers. Among the defenders of Thomism at that time, we may mention the Spaniard Valcarcel, who devoted his efforts to the refutation of Descartes, Spinoza, Malebranche and Locke; the Jesuit Barthélemy des Bosses (1688-1738), who corresponded with Wolf and Clarke and translated Leibniz's Theodicy; the Dominican Roselli, whose *Summa Philosophica* is said to have inspired the neo-Thomists of the nineteenth century.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the philosophy of St. Thomas had been almost completely abandoned. Catholics themselves were striving to build independent systems of thought. In Italy, the saintly founder of the Institute of Charity, Antonio Rosmini (1797-1855) advocated a kind of idealism which had been severely attacked by the early Roman Thomists. In Germany, Baader (1765-1841), Hermes (1775-1831), Frohschammer (1821-1893), and Günther (1783-1863) were greatly influenced by Hegelian idealism. Görres himself (1776-1848), one of the greatest German Catholics, advanced some philosophical principles more directly connected with spiritism than with Thomistic philosophy.

In France, traditionalism was in vogue. It was defended by De Bonald (1754-1840), Bonnetty (1798-1879), Bautain (1795-1867), Ventura de Raulica (1792-1861), and, in a slightly modified form, by Lamennais (1782-1854).

Some works of Ventura are, however, permeated by purely Thomistic principles, so that their author may justly be regarded as one of the immediate forerunners of the neo-Scho-

lastic revival in France. "In Father Ventura," says Cardinal Gonzalez, "two men may be considered. There may be seen, on the one hand, an enthusiastic admirer of St. Thomas, and, at the same time, a supporter of traditionalism, a disciple of De Maistre and De Bonald. In *La Philosophie chrétienne*, he is a genuine representative of Thomism, while in some other works, he seems driven by traditionalistic principles to the very limits of orthodoxy and reason."¹

During the first part of the nineteenth century, there were many signs of a return to the Middle Ages. The romantic movement in France strove to direct literature towards Mediæval customs and history. Hugo's "*Notre Dame de Paris*," published in 1831, contains a vivid picture of the life of Mediæval Paris. In other fields of human speculation, similar attempts were made. The philosophers of the Middle Ages soon became an object of general interest. Not long after the publication of *Notre Dame de Paris*, Victor Cousin (1792-1867) made known to the world unknown works of Abelard and Roger Bacon and published those learned studies about the Middle Ages which must be regarded as one of his most genuine titles to the gratitude of philosophy.

At the same time, another eminent scholar, Charles de Remusat (1797-1875), following the same line of research, wrote about Abelard, Anselm and Bacon. Barthélemy Haureau (1812-1896) published his remarkable works on the Middle Ages. The great Scholastic philosophers were at last emerging from the oblivion to which they had been so unjustly condemned.

In other European countries, identical tendencies could easily be discerned. In Germany, Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829) had already shown the real merit of Mediæval philosophy in his famous *History of Ancient and Modern Literature*. Among Catholic thinkers, a return to Thomistic principles was then effected. Möhler and his illustrious disciple Stauden-

¹ Cf. Gonzalez, *Historia de la Filosofía*, V. 4, pp. 428 ff.

maier (1800–1856), by their condemnation of all forms of rationalism and their strict orthodoxy, prepared the minds for the Scholastic revival which Kleutgen, Stöckl and Werner inaugurated so brilliantly in Germany.

Not long afterwards, Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire (1805–1895) translated the works of Aristotle, and Félix Ravaisson published his *Essai sur la métaphysique d'Aristote*, which greatly contributed to impose the peripatetic speculation upon the attention of the world. The way was thus fully prepared for Sanseverino and Kleutgen.

CHAPTER IX

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN ITALY

The direct initiator of the neo-Scholastic movement in Italy was Cajetano Sanseverino, canon of Naples.

Sanseverino (1811–1865) was at first an enthusiastic admirer of Descartes. The episode of his life which marked the turning-point of his philosophical career has been told by many historians. In the year 1840, Sanseverino received the visit of Father Sordi S. J., who had read and annotated St. Thomas's *Summa Theologica*. Sordi pointed out to Sanseverino the shortcomings of Descartes's thought and the superiority of the Thomistic principles in the solution of all philosophical problems. Great was the struggle for the devout canon. For twenty years, he applied himself to a thorough study of St. Thomas's philosophy. At the light of the *Summa Theologica* he read all modern writers and became more and more convinced of their insufficiency. The result of his investigations was the *Philosophia christiana cum antiqua et nova comparata*, a work which, unfinished as it is, consists of seven quarto volumes and displays an uncommon erudition, a remarkable knowledge of modern philosophy, and, above all, an enthusiastic admiration for the Angelic Doctor.

According to Cardinal Gonzalez, the *Philosophia christiana* has a double defect. With regard to its method, it presents a somewhat awkward distribution of arguments, and, at times, exceedingly diffuse articles. With regard to its spirit, it is too narrowly attached to the philosophy it defends. Sanseverino accepts St. Thomas's conclusions even in the minutest details, and despises modern thought as altogether vain and worthy of contempt.¹

¹ Cf. Gonzalez, *Philosophia elementaria*, pp. 383–384.

In spite of these defects, the *Philosophia christiana* has exercised an immense influence upon Catholic thinkers. For many years, it has been the great work of neo-Scholasticism, the fountain at whose pure waters all came to drink the spirit of the Thomistic regeneration. In its narrow-mindedness itself, it has found a multitude of followers. Too often have neo-Scholastics shared Sanseverino's contempt for modern thought. They have not even taken the trouble to read non-Scholastic writers in their original works. Why submit, indeed, to such a wearisome task? Had not Sanseverino done the work once for all? Had he not, from the narrowness of his cell, pronounced an ultimate verdict upon modern thinking? And thus, Sanseverino's word has been taken, not only with regard to the exposition of modern philosophical systems, but also with regard to his very criticisms.

The *Philosophia christiana* was at first the object of violent attacks. Cartesians and Rosminians agreed in denouncing it. But Sanseverino was defended by his disciple Signoriello, and encouraged by his archbishop, Riario Sforza. Shortly afterwards, an Academy of St. Thomas was founded at Naples, and honored by the approbation of Pius IX. All seemed to indicate that the efforts towards a Thomistic revival would be crowned with success.

The archiepiscopal see of Perugia was then occupied by Joachim Pecci who, as early as 1858, had founded an Academy of St. Thomas. Pecci was in close connection with Cardinal Sforza, with whose coöperation he had already written a refutation of Ontologism. He greatly sympathized with the Thomistic revival which was taking place in Naples, and addressed a memoir to Pius IX, asking him to declare St. Thomas patron of the universities.

At the same time, there lived, in another point of the Italian peninsula, a remarkable man, who was destined to be the very life of the new movement, to impose it *bon gré mal gré*, and

to silence all malcontents. It was the famous Jesuit John Mary Cornoldi.

Cornoldi is undoubtedly one of the most interesting figures of the neo-Scholastic revival. As soon as he heard of the work done in other places, he intended not to remain behind. Academies had been founded in Naples and Perugia: he would found in Bologna an Academy of his own. Unwilling, however, to be a mere imitator, he made up his mind to create something truly original. The two other Academies were simply philosophical; his would be medico-philosophical. The *Accademia filosofico-medica di San Tommaso* was accordingly founded (1874), in which Travaglini, Venturoli and Zanon represented science; Cornoldi, Battaglini and Rubbini, philosophy. The review *La Scienza Italiana*, the organ of the new institution, has been published until 1891.

In the Roman universities, however, Thomism did not as yet seem to gain a footing. The philosopher most in view in Rome at the time was the Jesuit Tongiorgi, a remarkable thinker, sometimes called by his admirers "the Balnes of Italy." On the whole, Tongiorgi's philosophy may be regarded as Thomistic. The few questions in which he departs from Scholastic principles are precisely those in which Scholastic principles are the weakest. He thus refuses to admit the theory of Matter and Form as an adequate explanation of the nature of bodies, and advocates a kind of Atomism. Nevertheless, Tongiorgi felt no sympathy for a revival of Thomism.

Such was the state of affairs when, in 1878, Joachim Pecci was elected Pope. The situation was at once greatly changed. Pius IX had sympathized with the Thomistic revival. He had even sent a letter of approbation to the archbishop of Naples. In Rome, however, unwilling to vex his anti-Thomistic professors, he had done nothing. As we shall see, the new pope will not hesitate to act more resolutely.

In the very letter in which he announced his elevation, Leo XIII quoted from the text of St. Paul: *videte ne quis vos*

decipiat per philosophiam, and greatly commended the philosophy of St. Thomas as the true philosophy. The Roman College at once adopted the views of the head of the Church; and, at the solemn session by which the school year 1878-79 opened, Father Cardella, speaking in the name of all, declared "that he would take St. Thomas as the rule and law of his teaching."²

The pope was delighted. His Roman professors, whom he had believed so obstinate, were as docile as children. Before he had said a word, they had understood and anticipated his wishes. So perfect seemed their dispositions! So splendid were their promises! Unhappily, they were promises only, and nothing was done. Father Palmieri, who had taken Tongiorgi's place, not only did not act in accordance with the papal instructions, but applied himself to point out from his chair the inconsistencies of St. Thomas's thought, the contradictions to which Scholasticism necessarily leads. As for Caretti—Palmieri's co-worker—he did not dare depart a whit from his dear Descartes, save to adopt metempsychosis. The pope's endeavor was decidedly a flat failure.

What could be done? Leo XIII's own brother and co-operator in Perugia, Joseph Pecci (1807-1890), then advised him to establish in Rome a free course of Thomism and to confide it to Father Cornoldi. The advice was judged excellent and immediately followed. Cornoldi arrived at Rome, proud of the reputation he had gained in Bologna as a scientist and a philosopher, and of the honorable mission he had just received of implanting the philosophy of St. Thomas in the very capital of the Christian world.

Cornoldi's course was open to all the students of the Roman University, and presided by the regular professors of the Roman College, to whom was added Joseph Pecci, who was soon made a cardinal. The subjects discussed were chiefly physics,

² Cf. Besse, *Deux centres du mouvement thomiste*, pp. 15-16.

psychology and metaphysics. To all questions whatsoever, Cornoldi, St. Thomas in hand, could answer! In the *Summa Theologica* was to be found the key to all difficulties of modern science!

At the same time, there began to spread a rumor that Leo XIII was preparing an encyclical letter about Christian philosophy. The uneasiness of the Cartesian professors was growing day by day. That Thomistic revival they had so much despised when confined to Naples and Perusa, was now taking Rome by storm. The dreaded encyclical appeared. Leo XIII greatly commended the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas and insisted upon a study of the genuine works of the great Scholastics:

“Providete ut sapientiam Thomæ ex ipsis ejus fontibus hauriatur.”³

More than any other Scholastic must St. Thomas be studied because he gathered all previously discovered truths in a great synthetic system, which he still considerably increased:

“Illorum doctrina, velut dispersa cujusdam corporis membra, in unum Thomas collegit et coagmentavit, miro ordine digessit, et magnis incrementis ita adauxit, ut catholicæ Ecclesiæ singulare præsidium et decus jure meritoque habeatur.”⁴

There is no part of philosophy which he has not solidly discussed:

“Nulla est philosophiæ pars, quam non acute simul et solide pertractarit: de legibus ratiocinandi, de Deo et incorporeis substantiis, de homine aliisque sensibilibus rebus, de humanis actibus eorumque principiis ita disputavit, ut in eo neque copiosa quæstionum seges, neque apta partium dispositio, neque optima procedendi ratio, neque principiorum firmitas aut argumentorum robur, neque dicendi perspicuitas aut proprietates, neque abstrusa quæque explicandi facilitas desideretur.”⁵

³ Encyclical *Æterni Patris*; In Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theol.*, Romæ, 1894, Vol. 6, pp. 425 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 432.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 432.

This return to the past, however, is far from being a retrogression. All Mediæval vain subtleties must be discarded. All Scholastic teachings which are not in harmony with modern scientific discoveries must be abandoned:

“Si quid enim est a doctoribus Scholasticis vel nimia subtilitate quesitum, vel parum considerate traditum, si quid cum exploratis posterioris ævi doctrinis minus coherens, vel denique quoquo modo non probabile, id nullo pacto in animo est ætati nostræ ad imitandum proponi.”⁶

Modern scientific progress must be welcomed as a benefit to philosophy:

“Non eos profecto improbamus doctos homines atque solertes, qui industriam et eruditionem suam, ac novorum inventorum opes ad excolendam philosophiam afferunt: id enim probe intelligimus ad incrementa doctrinæ pertinere.”⁷

The influence of the pope's encyclical was simply immense. The revival of Thomism, which had been limited to some isolated efforts, was then taken seriously by most of the Catholic thinkers. Suffice it to mention the celebrated professor of the Catholic University of Lille, Amédée de Margerie. Mr. de Margerie, although more than fifty years of age when the papal encyclical appeared, at once made a thorough study of the works of St. Thomas—which were completely unknown to him—and adopted his doctrine in a great many points.

In Rome itself, the success of the pope was complete. This was due in great part to the fact that Leo XIII, instructed by his first failure, took the precaution to corroborate his instructions by forcible measures. Palmieri and Caretti were discharged from their chairs, and the new appointments made left no doubt as to the final issue of the affair. All understood that this time the pope would be victorious.

The men honored by the papal choice as professors of phi-

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 436.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 434.

losophy, in Rome, were the following: Cornoldi was made professor at the Roman College, Zigliara at the Minerva, Lorenzelli and Satolli at the Propaganda, Talamo at the Apollinaris. As all these men have distinguished themselves by eminent productions, I will say a few words about each of them.

Giovanni Mari Cornoldi, S.J. (1822-1892), besides his two great works: *Institutiones Philosophiæ Speculativæ* and *La Filosofia Scolastica di San Tommaso e di Dante*, and numerous shorter treatises in which he defends the Scholastic principles and attacks opposite doctrines, especially Rosminianism (Cf. Bibliography), has contributed many articles to the *Civiltà Cattolica*. Less profound as a philosopher than Zigliara or Sanseverino, he has nevertheless done the greatest service to the neo-Thomistic cause by the very activity he has displayed. The direct aim of his great works, as well as of his numerous essays, is most praiseworthy. He strove to point out the perfect harmony existing between Thomism and science, to give a scientific basis to neo-Scholasticism. This is the very spirit which has recently inspired Desiré Mercier and the Institute of Louvain. Unhappily, Cornoldi's efforts have not always been intelligent and have met with little success. He is chiefly known to-day for his bitter criticisms of modern thought. In his *Prolegomeni*, he divides all philosophers into three groups: the true philosophers, that is to say, the Scholastics; the liberal philosophers, or those who do not accept all Scholastic doctrines; the non-philosophers, to which group all others belong.⁸ Well known is Cornoldi's phrase describing modern philosophy as "the pathology of human reason."⁹

Less unfair to moderns has been Thomas Zigliara, O.P. (1833-1893). His *Summa Philosophica*, in which he closely adheres to St. Thomas's doctrine, has, for a long time, served as a text-book in Catholic seminaries, and is much in use still to-day. His most valuable contribution to philosophy is prob-

⁸ Cf. Gomez Izquierdo, *Historia de la Filosofía del siglo XIX*, p. 464.

⁹ Cornoldi, *Leçons de Philosophie Scolastique*; Paris, 1878, p. 16.

ably the work entitled: *Della luce intellettuale*. The author refutes traditionalism and ontologism, and conclusively shows that the ontologists have no right to invoke the authority of St. Thomas to support their theories.

Benedetto Lorenzelli, actual archbishop of Lucca, has followed Aristotle in his *Philosophiæ Theoreticæ Institutiones*. How closely he shares Cornoldi's contempt for modern thought may be inferred from his division of philosophy into the four following periods: (1) a period of formation, from Thales to Aristotle; (2) a period of decrease and perversion, from Aristotle to Christ; (3) a period of increase and perfection, from Christ to Thomas Aquinas; (4) a period of corruption, from Descartes to our own day.¹⁰

Francesco Satolli is a faithful disciple of Cardinal Cajetan. At the example of the great commentator of the sixteenth century, he chiefly applies himself to the writing of learned commentaries on the works of the Angelic Doctor. In *Summam Theologicam Divi Thomæ Aquinatis* is the title of three successive treatises in which many questions of the *Summa Theologica* are expounded and studied.

In his *Logic (Enchiridion Philosophiæ, Pars Ia, continens logicam universam)*, Mgr. Satolli has been, like Lorenzelli, a disciple of Aristotle. He has been reproached with making an excessive use of dialectical reasoning, and thus rendering "intricate and labyrinthine" what is clear by itself. His last work, *De habitibus*, contains a valuable discussion of Spencer's theory of conduct.

Salvatore Talamo is chiefly known for his work, *L'Aristotelismo della Scolastica*, one of the most valuable productions of early Roman neo-Thomism. The aim of the treatise is to defend Scholastic philosophy against the unfounded reproach of servile Aristotelism, which, for several centuries, had been almost unanimously directed against the schoolmen.

The first chapters of the work deal with the character of

¹⁰ Cf. Gomez Izquierdo, *op. cit.*, p. 464.

Mediæval speculation. The author clearly shows that the philosophy of the schoolmen, although intimately connected with theology, had an object and a method of its own, with which theology was not concerned.

In the second part, the author studies the ground of the preference given to Aristotle in the Middle Ages. The reasons he assigns are the following:

1. Aristotle was the greatest master, nay the inventor of one of the most important branches of philosophy, the science of logic, which studies the laws of our mind and the method we must follow in the research of truth.

2. Aristotle's works contained a treasure of information about all branches of human knowledge: natural science, ethics, politics, psychology, metaphysics, etc.

3. Aristotle gave the example of a methodic discussion and a concise style, rejecting the beautiful garb under which Plato often concealed the impossibility of a demonstration.

4. Finally, the Stagirite revealed to the curiosity of the Mediæval philosophers the origin of philosophy and its development among the Greeks.¹¹

The enthusiasm with which the philosophy of Aristotle was accepted was, however, far from mere slavishness. Whenever the Scholastics found in Aristotle some theory they judged erroneous, they did not hesitate to reject it.¹² They likewise modified and perfected the system of the master in a great many points. With regard to the essential relations between the universe and God, the final end of man, the spirituality and immortality of the soul, etc., they taught definite doctrines which Aristotle had denied or very imperfectly treated.¹³ Their conception of the act of creation was also essentially different from Aristotle's conception. Aristotle had admitted God as the

¹¹ Cf. Talamo, *L'Aristotelismo della Scolastica*, 3. ed., Siena, 1881, pp. 234 ff.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 151 ff.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 361 ff.

necessary cause of the world, but had regarded him simply as a demiurge acting upon eternally preëxisting matter. The Scholastics conceived creation as a production of the world out of nothing.¹⁴

While the professors we have mentioned were working hard for the success of their cause, there came into notice another man who had not attracted the attention at first, perhaps because he shunned public notice, who had written much, however, and who, from the silence of his cell, proved as able a defender of the new movement as the men who were expounding their views from a university's cathedra.

Matteo Liberatore, S.J. (1810–1892), was already an old man at the time we consider. His *Institutiones Philosophicæ*, published many years before, had been often reissued, and, as well as Zigliara's *Summa*, have proved an excellent text-book in many Catholic institutions. Anticipating the pope's advice, Liberatore had shunned all useless questions, and had defended the essential principles of Scholasticism in a clear and elegant language. Not satisfied with the general exposition contained in his first work, he later took up some special topics, chiefly in the field of Scholastic psychology, and published learned treatises, which have been translated into various languages (cf. Bibliography). He even made use of the dramatic form to defend his philosophical theories, as in *L'autocrazia dell'ente*, comedy in three acts (Naples, 1880). His works do not evince a deep knowledge of the philosophical thought outside of Italy; but he has mastered Italian philosophy and given thorough criticisms of the doctrines of Gioberti and Rosmini. The latter part of his life was devoted to social studies. He pointed out the way in which the Catholic Church can accommodate itself to a certain kind of socialism. Finally, Liberatore was one of the founders of the review *Civiltà Cattolica* (1850), which has not ceased to be one of the most efficient organs of Catholic thought in Italy.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 151.

In the meantime, the success of the Roman professors was becoming more and more complete. In 1880, Leo XIII ordered the preparation of a new edition of the works of St. Thomas. At the same time, an Academy of St. Thomas was founded in Rome itself (October 13, 1879). It was composed of thirty members: ten taken from Rome, ten from the rest of Italy, ten from other countries. Pecci and Zigliara were chosen as presidents.¹⁵

The work of the *Accademia Romana di San Tommaso* soon attracted the attention and the criticisms of the Italian thinkers. It was claimed that the new Scholastics were not following the precepts of Leo XIII, that they applied the Thomistic principles to scientific discoveries in the most ridiculous manner, that they had produced nothing original, save repeated attacks on Rosmini. These charges, formulated as early as 1886 by Benzoni in the *Rivista italiana di Filosofia*, have been taken up again by Besse, in his pamphlet, *Deux centres du mouvement thomiste*. The aim of Mr. Besse in this little treatise is to compare the work done at Rome by the early neo-Scholastics with the work done at Louvain to-day, and to show that at Louvain only something truly philosophical has been accomplished; that the Louvain professors alone have acted in agreement with the papal instructions and with the necessities of our time.

The most important charges formulated by Mr. Besse against the Roman Thomists are the following:

1. On all points common to philosophy and faith, the Roman Thomists strove to connect the natural and the supernatural, and became mere interpreters of the Christian dogmas.¹⁶
2. They did not study modern philosophy, but uncritically accepted Sanseverino's conclusions. Their criticisms, therefore, contain nothing personal, nothing serious, and have brought discredit upon the cause their authors pretended to defend.¹⁷

¹⁵ Cf. Blane, *Histoire de la Philosophie*, t. 3, p. 559.

¹⁶ Besse, *Deux centres du mouvement thomiste*, p. 25.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.

3. Lacking all principles of critical method, the Roman Thomists have not even succeeded in their interpretations of St. Thomas.¹⁸

Mr. Besse excepts from his wholesale condemnation Signoriello for his *Vocabularium peripatetico-scholasticum*, and Talamo for his study on Aristotle. But these examples, the author continues, have found no imitators.¹⁹

¶The truth contained in Mr. Besse's pamphlet must be frankly acknowledged. Roman Thomists have often remained in a complete ignorance of the spirit and the contents of modern philosophy. Without understanding modern thinkers, they have mercilessly condemned them. Non-Scholastic philosophical productions have been described as heretical; their authors, even the most inoffensive, as men who had wilfully opposed all rules of common sense and truth. The neo-Scholastic movement has thus ostracized itself from the current of modern thought. It has failed to attract the attention of the non-Catholic world. Its very existence has been, for a long time, systematically ignored. Only in recent years, and after taking another direction, has neo-Scholasticism been deemed worthy of study. Only after neo-Kantians have become convinced that the professors of Louvain possessed a knowledge of the Kantian philosophy which would honor any center of learning have they begun to ask themselves whether neo-Scholasticism could not contain something good, whether it is not a philosophy.

¶Mr. Besse, however, has probably overlooked a most important fact, which might have led him to modify his sentence of condemnation. The early Roman Thomists were not in the same position as their followers of the present day. Their aim was not to impose the Thomistic revival upon the consideration of the world of philosophy at large, but to effect its acceptance from the part of the Catholic Church. Only after Thomism had gained a sure footing among Catholic thinkers could it step

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 34, note.

boldly forward and proclaim its existence to the outside world. This is the reason why the Roman Thomists have worked hard and fast to show the perfect harmony of their system with the body of revealed truths. It is the reason why they have made merciless attacks upon all other philosophies, and have seen a heresy where there was at most an error.)

The neo-Thomists of the present day ought not to censure too hastily the work of their older brethren. It is the Roman Scholastics that have firmly implanted Thomism in the Catholic world. They have faithfully grasped the task that lay before them, and have fulfilled it with the greatest success. The means they have taken were, on the whole, the best they could take, the only ones, perhaps, that could insure success.

The early neo-Thomists we have studied have found numerous disciples who have continued and perfected the work of the masters. In 1879, the Lazarist Albert Barberis (1847-1896) founded in Piacenza a Latin philosophical review, the *Divus Thomas*, which has been the organ of neo-Scholasticism in Italy, and in which Tornatore, Vinati, Ermoni, and other eminent men, have published learned dissertations. The professors of Louvain themselves have occasionally honored the *Divus Thomas* by their articles. Quite recently, the publication of the *Divus Thomas* has been interrupted. Nobody regrets the fact more sincerely than we do. It is perhaps true that modern languages are a more suitable instrument than Latin for philosophical discussions. All interested in neo-Scholasticism were none the less glad to read dissertations written by modern Scholastics in the very language of the schoolmen. After having enjoyed the *Divus Thomas* for so many years, we feel that its actual absence is a real lack to Scholastic literature, and we sincerely implore the distinguished professors of Piacenza to alter their decision and begin their work anew.

Barberis is also the author of two Latin dissertations: *Positivismus ac nova methodus psychologica* (1887), and *Esse formale estne rei intrinsecum an non?* (1887), which, by the solid-

ity of the reasoning and the depth of the doctrine, assure their author a place among the most profound metaphysicians of our day.

Among the recent defenders of neo-Scholasticism in Italy, the best known are: the Jesuits Schiffini, De Maria and Salis Seewis, and the distinguished professor of Pavia, Giuseppe Ballerini.

Santo Schiffini (1841-1906), for a long time professor at the Gregorian University, published a complete and detailed course of Scholastic philosophy. His *Principia philosophica* deal with logic and ontology; his *Disputationes metaphysicæ specialis*, with cosmology; his *Disputationes philosophiæ moralis*, with moral philosophy. In 1888, in a learned article of the *Annales de Philosophie chrétienne*, Count Domet de Vorges praised Schiffini's Ontology as the most solid and profound then existing.²⁰ One of the most interesting studies Schiffini's volumes contain is an analysis of the influence of will upon belief, which reminds us of the tenets of our pragmatists.

Michael de Maria became famous in 1892, after publishing three volumes of philosophical studies with the title *Philosophia Peripatetico-Scholastica*. In his criticisms of modern philosophy, De Maria closely resembles his Roman predecessors. In his contempt for modern thought, he is not far from Cornoldi's position, as may be gathered from the following passage of his preface:

"Prineipio quidem semper persuasum habui, philosophiam ad tot absurda et incredibilia amplectenda in ipsa Christianæ societatis luce eo misere nostris temporibus declinasse, quod paulatim et pedententim ab illis principiis discessit quæ S. Thomas ex Aristotele accepta mirifice illustravit et cum Christiana revelatione composuit. Ex quo facile erat intelligere nullam meliorem expediendæ salutis reperiri posse viam, quam ad illam sapientiam plane reverti, a qua inconsulte admodum et temere discessum est."²¹

²⁰ Cf. Domet de Vorges, *Bibliographie de la Philosophie thomiste de 1877 à 1887*; *Ann. de Philos. chr.*, vol. xviii, pp. 529 ff.

²¹ De Maria, *Philosophia Peripatetico-Scholastica*, Vol. 1, p. viii.

De Maria's work, however, is excellent in many respects. Besides its intrinsic value as an exposition of the Scholastic philosophy, it presents a special interest on account of the profound studies it contains about St. Thomas's doctrine on some special topics, viz., on essence and existence,²² on the nature of the individual,²³ etc.

Francis Salis Seewis (1835-1898) is chiefly known for his treatise, *Della conoscenza sensitiva*, published in 1881, and a study of the doctrines of St. Augustine, St. Thomas and Suarez on spontaneous generation, published in 1897. The author studies the Scholastic doctrines from the point of view of modern physiology and compares the teachings of St. Thomas with the positive results obtained in our day by Helmholtz, Wundt, Weber, etc. By his careful study of modern scientific discoveries, Salis Seewis frankly departs from the contemptuous neglect of the early Roman Thomists and opens to the neo-Scholastic movement in Italy an era of progress.²⁴

Giuseppe Ballerini, already known by a treatise on socialism and a theological dissertation about the Eucharistic dogma, published in 1904 a study on the principle of causality and the existence of God, *Il principio di causalità e l'esistenza di Dio di fronte alla scienza moderna*. He regards the principle of causality as the real point at issue between the Scholastics and their opponents. He discusses its objectivity, combats Hume's theories, and shows the connection of the idea of cause with the belief in the existence of God.

A complete study of neo-Scholasticism in Italy should contain the names of the Jesuits De Mandato, Remer, and Taparelli d'Azeglio, the author of the celebrated *Saggio di Diritto naturale*; of Priseo, Chiesa, Cappellazzi, Puccini, and of the distinguished logician Lorenzo Schiavi. It should not fail to mention the accurate and painstaking edition of the works of St. Bona-

²² *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 441 ff.

²³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 529 ff.

²⁴ Cf. Gomez Izquierdo, *op. cit.*, p. 450.

venture, begun in 1882 by the Franciscan fathers of Quaracchi, near Florence, who have thereby done an immense service to the cause of Scholasticism. The same fathers are actually promising to the learned world a critical edition of the works of Roger Bacon. Finally, one of them, Mariano Fernandez Garcia, has just published a work which will be of great help for the study of Duns Scotus's philosophy. Its title is: *Lexicon Scholasticum Philosophico-Theologicum, in quo continentur termini, definitiones, distinctiones et effata a B. Joanne Duns Scoto Doctore Subtili.*

CHAPTER X

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN SPAIN, PORTUGAL, AND SPANISH AMERICA

SECTION 1.—THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN SPAIN

Our ordinary philosophical studies in American institutions may easily lead us to the belief that there is no such a thing as a Spanish philosophy. Who, among our university students, has ever heard of a Spanish philosopher? Who could presently name one? Our complete ignorance on this point must perhaps be excused. Some years ago, Mr. Guardia wrote an article in the *Revue Philosophique* to prove that we are right. He gave it the attractive title of *La misère philosophique en Espagne*, and strongly defended the thesis that Spain possesses no philosophy.¹ The same thesis had been defended a few years before by the Mexican priest Agustin Rivera, who had extended his condemnation to the Spanish-speaking countries of the New World.² Few Spaniards, however, would agree with these two men. Patriotism is strong beyond the Pyrenees, and the assertions to which it frequently leads the fiery sons of Pelayo would sound incredible to the cool-headed Anglo-Saxon race. It seems that the distinguished writer Marcelino Menendez y Pelayo has placed Spanish philosophy on equal footing with the philosophical systems of France and Italy, and has judged it inferior only to Greek and German speculation. To most of us, this judgment would seem rather bold. It has been condemned as too timid by William Garcia, who does not hesitate to give Spanish philosophy the first place. His line of reasoning is very simple. He summarily dismisses German philosophy

¹ *Rev. Philos.*, 1893, pp. 287 ff.

² In the work: *La Filosofía en la Nueva España*, Lagos, 1885.

as a mere play of imagination and no knowledge of truth. As regards Greek philosophy, Garcia, as a genuine Scholastic, does full justice to Aristotle; but, he adds, Aristotle has been surpassed by St. Thomas, so that the Thomistic, or Italian philosophy, is really the first philosophy. Now, the Thomistic philosophy has become Spanish by right of conquest. Hence, it is clear that Spanish philosophy is the first philosophy.³

Our belief as to the real worth of Spanish thought may be greatly influenced by the point of view from which we study the question. A Kantian, for example, can hardly be proud of the influence the *Critique of Pure Reason* has exercised on the Spanish soil. If, as Mr. Latinus points out, only two Spaniards, during the nineteenth century, have judged it useful to go and study philosophy in Germany, if the physician Nieto Serrano is actually the only Kantian in Spain,⁴ all who maintain that philosophy must flow from Koenigsberg, that we must go back to Kant, will be apt to be as severe to Spanish thought as Rivera and Guardia have been.

A neo-Scholastic will no doubt be more indulgent. Spain is perhaps the only country in which the Scholastic traditions have never been entirely forgotten. A long time before Sanseverino published his *Philosophia Christiana* and Leo XIII his encyclical, distinguished Spaniards had defended the essential principles of the Aristotelian and Thomistic philosophy. During the course of the nineteenth century, Spain, as we shall see, has produced three great philosophers who are certainly among the greatest of whom the Scholastic revival may boast. One of them, Urraburu, is still living; the other two, Balmes and Gonzalez, have departed from this world many years ago, but their works are immortal.

At the end of the eighteenth century, the sensism of Locke and Condillae was introduced into Spain and gained many dis-

³ Garcia, *Tomismo y Neotomismo*, pp. 350-351.

⁴ Latinus, Une excursion philosophique en Espagne, *Rev. Neo-Scol.*, 1901, pp. 192 ff.

ciples. Among its best known adherents may be mentioned the Jesuits Eximeno and Andres. Scholasticism, however, did not disappear altogether. It was defended by Rafael Puigecerver, O.P., in his *Philosophia Sancti Thomæ Aquinatis, auribus hujus temporis accommodata*, which was used as a text-book in many institutions.

Not long afterwards, Francisco Alvarado, O.P. (1756–1814), generally known as “el filósofo rancio” (the rank philosopher), acquired a great celebrity by his *Cartas Aristotélicas* and his *Cartas Críticas*, in which he defended the philosophy of St. Thomas against the heterodox, political, social and philosophical theories which had been recently introduced into Spain.

But the man who gave to Spanish philosophy its greatest splendor during the first half of the nineteenth century was undoubtedly Balmes.

James Balmes was born in Vich (Catalonia) in 1810 and died in 1848. Completely unknown in 1840, he acquired in a few years an immense reputation. He alone succeeded in awakening the interest of Europe in Spanish thought. Besides numerous social productions, among which must be mentioned a comparative study of Protestantism and Catholicism with regard to their influence upon European civilization, Balmes has written the following philosophical works: *El Criterio*, or a study of the criteria of truth, which, in Mr. Turner’s opinion, is his most valuable contribution to philosophy; *Cartas á un escéptico*, a collection of letters in which scepticism is most ably discussed; *Filosofía elemental*; and *Filosofía fundamental*, the work upon which his fame as a philosopher chiefly rests.

Orestes A. Brownson declares the Fundamental Philosophy to be not only Balmes’s masterpiece, but the most important work published on the bases of philosophy during the nineteenth century.⁵ This judgment is too eulogistic perhaps; but we must at least admit that Balmes’s work has acquired the charac-

⁵ Balmes, *Fundamental Philosophy*, New York, 1903: Brownson’s Introduction, p. viii.

ter of a philosophical classic, and will be studied as long as philosophy endures upon the face of the earth.

When Balmes wrote his works, there were as yet no signs of a return to Thomism. His philosophy, accordingly, is not directly connected with the neo-Scholastic revival. It is, however, Thomistic in its essential character and in most of its details. Thomas Aquinas was the favorite author of the Spanish thinker, who regarded the *Summa Theologica* as the fountain of all truth. Balmes's thought has also been influenced, although in a less degree, by Descartes and the Scottish school. Greatly sympathetic to Reid, Balmes professes the same aversion to Idealism, and, speaking of Berkeley, exclaims: "Insanity is insanity still, however sublime it may be."⁶

Unlike the early Roman Thomists, Balmes possesses a remarkable knowledge of modern philosophy. He knows thoroughly Descartes, Locke, Condillae, Hume, Lamennais, and his criticisms of Kant may be read with profit even to-day by all students of German philosophy. One of the ideals which Balmes cherished, and which a premature death did not allow him to realize, was a thorough study and a refutation of German idealism. Strange to say, Balmes is, however, less far from Kant than he supposes.

Kant teaches the subjectivity of space. Balmes says:

"The idea of extension is a primitive fact of our mind. It is not produced by sensations, but precedes them, if not in time, at least in the order of being."⁷

Kant teaches that our knowledge of the external world is nothing but a knowledge of phenomena, and that the thing-in-itself is unknowable. Balmes says:

"A pure spirit—the existence of which we must always suppose; for, though all finite beings were annihilated, there would still remain the infinite being which is God—a pure spirit would

* Balmes, *Fundamental Philosophy*, V. 1, p. 11.

⁷ *Ibid.*, V. 1, p. 347.

know the extended world just as it is in itself, and would not have the sensible representations either external or internal which we have.”⁸

Kant teaches that, even with regard to our own self, our knowledge is phenomenal. Balmes says:

“The Ego does not see itself intuitively; it is offered to itself only mediately, by its acts: that is, so far as it is known, it is in the same category as all other external beings, which are all known by their effect upon us.”⁹

A comparative study of the philosophies of Balmes and Kant would be of great interest. The scope of this treatise obliges us to limit ourselves to a suggestion and a few remarks. Whatever the conclusions of such a study might be, one thing is beyond doubt: Balmes's principles show a marked tendency to subjectivism. He professes that we possess certainty only with regard to internal phenomena, and that we know external objects by means of a natural instinct.

Ramon Marti de Eixala (died 1857), although lacking the depth of genius of Balmes, exercised a more direct influence upon Spanish thinking. Surrounded by a number of disciples, he gave birth to the school known as “Catalonian school.” One of his disciples, Llorens, eagerly entered into the spirit of the Thomistic revival which was then taking place in Italy, and, during the last years of his life, strove to put his doctrine in perfect harmony with those of Sanseverino and Cornoldi.

Not long afterwards, the same province of Catalonia, proud of such thinkers as Marti and Balmes, produced another philosopher of real merit, Antonio Comellas.

Antonio Comellas y Cluet (1832–1884) has not enjoyed during his life the noisy celebrity in which other men delight. Even after his death, he has remained unknown for many years, and his name would probably be forgotten to-day were it not

⁸ *Ibid.*, V. 1, p. 432.

⁹ *Ibid.*, V. 1, p. 42.

for the learned study made by the distinguished historian of philosophy, Gomez Izquierdo, in the review *La Cultura Española* (cf. Bibliography). Comellas's life, as Gomez Izquierdo points out, may be summed up in these two words: Solitude and study.

His greatest contribution to philosophy are his *Demonstración de la armonía entre la religión católica y la ciencia* and his *Introducción á la Filosofía*.

The man who has raised Spanish philosophy to its greatest height during the second half of the nineteenth century is Cardinal Gonzalez.

Zeferino Gonzalez y Diaz-Tuñon (1831-1892), born in Viloria, entered the Dominican order at the age of thirteen and was sent, when quite a young man, to the mission of the Philippines. In Manila, he taught philosophy and theology and published his first work: *Estudios sobre la Filosofía de Santo Tomas*, which evinces a deep knowledge of the philosophy of the Angelic Doctor, and is regarded by many critics as the most remarkable work on the subject written during the nineteenth century.

Compelled by his health to return to Spain in 1865, Gonzalez contributed to *La Ciudad de Dios* and other periodicals numerous philosophical essays. His *Philosophia elementaria*, his *Estudios religiosos, filosóficos, científicos y sociales*, his most recent work, *La Biblia y la Ciencia* (1891), and especially his *Historia de la Filosofía*, in which a whole volume is devoted to Mediæval philosophy, have given the last touch to his reputation as a philosopher and assured him a place among the greatest thinkers of his country and the most genuine defenders and propagators of neo-Scholasticism.

Cotemporaneous with Gonzalez are Orti y Lara and Pidal y Mon.

Juan Manuel Orti y Lara has written immensely. His most important philosophical works may be seen in our bibliography. Besides his *Psicología*, his *Lógica*, his *Ética* and other constructive works, he deserves the gratitude of neo-Scholastics for his

refutation of the pantheistic philosophy of Krause and of the work of Draper. His conception of the Thomistic movement is, however, very narrow. Orti y Lara does not take any interest in modern philosophy, which he regards as "resting upon error and sin."¹⁰

Alejandro Pidal y Mon, born in Madrid in 1847, is chiefly known as a political writer. His principal contributions to philosophy are a work entitled *Sistemas filosóficos* (1873), and a study on St. Thomas, *Santo Tomás de Aquino* (1875), which has been greatly praised by Cardinal Gonzalez.

Among the most recent Spanish neo-Scholastics, let us mention: Arnaiz, Cepeda, Daurella, Donadiu, Gonzalez y Arintero, Lemos, Hernández y Fajarnés, Miralles y Sbert, the Jesuits Urráburu and Mendive, the historian of philosophy Gómez Izquierdo.

J. Mendive, S.J. (died 1906), is the author of a course of philosophy, written at first in Spanish, and afterwards published in Latin (1886). Like many other Jesuits, he has been reproached with following Suarez too closely in his interpretations of St. Thomas.

Antonio Hernandez y Fajarnés, professor in the University of Zaragoza, is the author of a series of philosophical and scientific works in which the fundamental principles of Scholasticism are defended and opposed to the antagonistic modern theories. His first work, *Psicología celular* (1884), is an able refutation of Haeckel's biological theories. His *Ontología* (1887) is directed against positivism.

Juan Gonzalez de Arintero, O.P., published in 1904 a work entitled *La Providencia y la Evolución*, whose chief aim is the proof of the existence of finality in the universe. Fr. Arintero attacks the doctrine of pure chance; and, in his chapter on evolution, clearly shows that evolution without finality is contrary to reason, to experience, to science itself.

¹⁰ Cf. Latinus, Une excursion philosophique en Espagne, *Rev. Neo-Scol.*, 1901.

No less profound is the scientific knowledge of Placido Angel Lemos. In his work, *La Vida Orgánica*, published in 1902, he defends the validity of the concept of substance, proves against Haeckel the unity of the living being, studies the origin of life upon the earth, and strives to show that a perfect harmony exists between scientific discoveries and the teachings of the Bible.

Mr. Alberto Gomez Izquierdo, actually professor in the seminary of Zaragoza, has contributed to the *Revista de Aragón* and the *Cultura Española* numerous articles in which he has ventilated interesting questions concerning the history of philosophy. He has also published a *History of Philosophy in the XIX century*, which is one of the most important and best documented works we possess on the subject. Mr. Gomez has entirely omitted Spanish philosophy from his History, but he has promised a separate volume on the subject, which all who are interested in philosophical researches expect with feverish eagerness.

John Joseph Urráburu, S.J., published in 1890 eight big Latin quarto volumes with the title *Institutiones Philosophicæ*. The first deals with Logic, the second with Ontology, the third with Cosmology, the next three with Psychology, the last two with Natural Theology.

Some years afterwards, he exposed his teachings anew in a more concise form, and published a *Compendium Philosophiæ Scholasticæ* which, in spite of its modest title, consists of no less than five large octavo volumes.

Fr. Urráburu's works constitute a monumental production, one of the greatest treasures neo-Scholastic literature possesses. In his method, Urráburu is a pure Roman Thomist. He uses the Latin language, the syllogistic form, and proves the truth of his teachings from the authority of the Church and the Divine Revelation as often and as willingly as by human reason. He differs from many Roman Thomists by his knowledge of modern scientific results. The conclusions he derives from these results are not always justifiable, but his knowledge of the scientific facts themselves cannot be denied.

Urráburu's works—perhaps on account of the very method they follow—have not attracted the attention they deserve. Their author's name is not even mentioned in Mr. Blanc's *Dictionnaire de Philosophie*, published in 1906. The actual current of neo-Scholasticism, chiefly due to the influence of Mgr. Mercier and the Institute of Louvain, is unfavorable to Urráburu. It professes that the Latin language ought to be discarded in philosophical discussions, and that philosophy ought to be regarded as a science which must go its own way, without any predeterminate conclusion imposed by theological beliefs. To the objection that this has not been the method followed by St. Thomas, the Scholastics of Louvain would answer that St. Thomas acted in harmony with the spirit of his time, and that, if he lived now, he would likewise act in harmony with the spirit and methods of our day. This may be very true, but it proves too much. If St. Thomas lived to-day, a Positivist might ask, if he breathed in our intellectual atmosphere, would he be a Dominican? Would he be a Scholastic?

Urráburu's method is perhaps, on the whole, more consistent with the principles of Scholasticism than his opponents' view. The Scholastics of Louvain are as profoundly convinced of the truth of the doctrines of the Church as Urráburu is. They believe as strongly as the eminent Spaniard that a philosophical or a scientific conclusion opposed to the revealed truths is erroneous and must be rejected. If such be the case, and if the primary aim of philosophy be the attainment of truth, is it not illogical to abstain from taking theological doctrines as a guide in philosophical investigations?

A proof from Scripture will not appeal to the modern mind. In Protestant countries especially it will sound as profoundly unphilosophical. But we must not forget that Urráburu writes in a Catholic country and for Catholic readers. The spirit of free interpretation has led Protestant theology very far. Many Protestant ministers to-day doubt the existence of hell, and a few are inclined to transform a personal God into an ethical or

metaphysical principle. The case of the Catholic clergy is quite different. All who are really Catholics firmly believe, not only in a personal God, who sees us and watches over us, in a hell in which the reprobate will be tortured with the devils during the whole eternity, but even in the Immaculate Conception and the infallibility of the pope.

It cannot be denied that the spirit of Louvain is more in harmony with modern thought. This is the reason why the works published by the *Institut Supérieur de Philosophie* have been translated into various languages and have attracted the attention of all Europe, whereas Urráburu's bulky volumes have been forgotten in some dusty corner of a conventual library. The study of the works of the learned Jesuit is, however, indispensable for an adequate understanding of the spirit of Scholasticism.

Let us not leave Spain without mentioning some important reviews which have greatly helped the cause of neo-Thomism. *Razón y Fé*, *La Ciudad de Dios*, the *Revista de Aragón*, and the *Cultura Española* have published articles of great interest. Of greater interest still is the *Revista Luliana*, founded in Barcelona in 1901, and whose aim is the publication and the critical interpretation of the works of the Mediæval Spanish philosopher Raymond Lully.

SECTION 2.—THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN PORTUGAL¹¹

The march of philosophy in Portugal is closely connected with that of philosophy in Spain. Both countries have been inspired by the same masters, and have followed parallel directions in their speculation. By the end of the eighteenth century, the dominant system in Portuguese institutions was a sensism inspired by Locke and Condillac. The Jesuits of Coimbra, who alone clung to an orthodox Thomism, were severely attacked by other religious orders, especially by the Oratorians and Augustinians. Condillac's *Art de Penser* was

¹¹ Cf. Ferreira-Deusdado, *La Philosophie Thomiste en Portugal*, *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1898.

translated into Portuguese and published in 1818. The Oratorian Fr. John the Baptist, the archdeacon Luiz Antonio Verney and Theodoro d'Almeida frankly introduced modern systems of thought into the Portuguese philosophical circles.

Little was done in Portugal for a restoration of Thomism before the publication of Leo XIII's encyclical. The few contributions to Scholastic literature written in Portuguese during that period, do not belong to Portugal proper, but to Asia or America.

In Macao, the Jesuit Francis X. Rondina (1827-1897), an Italian by birth, published in 1869 a course of philosophy in harmony with the Scholastic principles. The title of the work is: *Compendio de Philosophia theoretica e pratica para uso da mocidade portuguesa na China*. The author has been directly inspired by St. Thomas, Suarez, Goudin, Balmes, Gonzalez, and, to a certain extent, by Rosmini.

Two years later, Jose Soriano de Sousa, professor in Pernambuco (Brazil), published his *Licções de Philosophia elementar racional e moral*, perfectly Thomistic in spirit, which he dedicated to Emperor Pedro II.

After the promulgation of the encyclical *Æterni Patris*, the Catholics of Portugal entered without hesitation into the spirit of the Roman Pontiff. By the philosophical academies they founded, the reviews and the works they published, they have assured to their country a conspicuous place in the history of neo-Thomism.

In 1881, an Academy of St. Thomas was founded in Coimbra, and, by means of its organ, the review *Instituições cristas*, actively contributed to turn the attention of Portugal to the Thomistic revival. The foundation of the Academy of St. Thomas was soon followed by the publication of philosophical works inspired by Scholastic principles. Among the writers who thus served the cause of neo-Scholasticism, the best known are Sinibaldi, Pereira Gomez de Carvalho and Madureira.

Thiago Sinibaldi, professor in the seminary of Coimbra, pub-

lished in 1889 his *Prælectiones Philosophiæ christianæ*, and, three years later, his *Elementos de Philosophia*, which has been honored by several editions.

Clement Pereira Gomez de Carvalho, professor in the Central Lyceum of Coimbra, is also the author of a work entitled *Elementos de Philosophia*, which was published in 1894.

Bernardo Augusto de Madureira, professor in the Faculty of Theology of the University of Coimbra, published, in 1884, a poem entitled, *O sol d'Aquino*, which deals with the life and the philosophy of the Angelic Doctor, and was dedicated by the author to the new-born Academy of St. Thomas. Since that time, Mr. Madureira has also published a manual of Elementary Philosophy (1896).

Another active supporter of neo-Thomism in Portugal is Mr. Manuel Jose Martins Capella, to whose initiative is due the foundation of a chair of Thomistic philosophy in the seminary of Braga (1892).

More recently, Mr. Teixeira Guedes has organized in Santarem a Philosophical and Literary Academy, whose aim is the diffusion of the Thomistic doctrines among the people. The Academy has been inaugurated in 1897 by the Cardinal Archbishop of Lisbon.

SECTION 3.—THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN MEXICO

By the middle of the nineteenth century, Scholastic philosophy had practically disappeared from the Mexican soil. Even Catholics regarded with the greatest disrespect a system which, in previous centuries, had been defended in Mexico by so many illustrious thinkers. From August, 1845, to May, 1847, there was published in Mexico a religious, political, scientific and literary periodical, known as *El Católico*. Its columns contained numerous articles dealing with History of Philosophy, especially with Scholasticism. These articles were published anonymously, but it appears from the works of the eminent historian

Valverde Tellez that they were due to the pen of the Jesuit Arrillaga.¹²

Arrillaga defines Scholasticism in terms of its method of exposition, gives a cold praise to Abelard and Thomas Aquinas, calling them "rare geniuses who, in another time, could have done wonders," is particularly severe towards Duns Scotus, speaks of Lully's *Ars magna* as of a collection of extravagances. Similar views were current at the time. The greatest Catholic thinker Mexico has produced, Clemente de Jesus Munguía, does not absolutely escape them. After exposing the Scholastic doctrine about the origin of ideas, the distinguished bishop finds himself at a loss to explain how "such an absurd theory could enjoy so great a vogue, and for so long a time, among philosophers."¹³

The philosophical system of Munguía, however, agrees in the main with the principles of the School. He who has been called by his admirers "the Balmes of Mexico" may be regarded with justice as one of the forerunners of the neo-Scholastic movement in his country. Our bibliography contains the titles of his most important philosophical publications.

The first man who, by his writings and his influence, directly contributed to the revival of Thomism in Mexico is Bishop Sollano.

José María de Jesús Díez de Sollano y Dávalos was born in San Miguel de Allende (Guanajuato) in 1820. After studying in his native town and in Mexico, he was ordained priest in 1844, and became successively rector of the College of San Gregorio, of the Seminary and of the University. In 1863 he was made bishop of Leon by Pius IX. He died in 1881.

The philosophical writings of Bishop Sollano are not of great importance. They are limited to an annotated edition of Roux's *Logie*, a pastoral letter dealing with the encyclical *Æterni*

¹² Cf. Valverde Tellez, *Bibliografía Filosófica Mexicana*, p. 41.

¹³ Cf. Valverde Tellez, *Apuntaciones históricas de la Filosofía en México*, p. 262.

Patris, and a dissertation about the Immaculate Conception. Nevertheless, Sollano must be regarded as one of the best propagators of neo-Scholasticism in Mexico, on account of the influence he exercised upon the direction of philosophy in making of his seminary of Leon one of the most active centers of neo-Thomism.

From all parts of the Mexican republic there soon arose distinguished writers to defend the essential principles of Scholastic philosophy, so that the neo-Scholastic movement in Mexico can compare without too much disadvantage with the same movement in European nations.

Agustin de la Rosa (born 1824), canon of Guadalajara, defended the Scholastic doctrine of truth in his *Consideraciones filosóficas sobre la Verdad y la Certidumbre* (1870).

José M. de Jesús Portugal, bishop of Aguascalientes, wrote, with the titles of *El Amable Jesus* and *La Santa voluntad de Dios*, excellent commentaries on the works of St. Thomas. *El Amable Jesus* is a commentary on the third part of the *Summa Theologica*, whereas *La Santa Voluntad de Dios* deals with the *Summa contra Gentiles*.

Agustin F. Villa greatly facilitated the study of Scholastic philosophy by the publication of a Vocabulary of Scholastic Terms (1879).

Nicanor Lozada published in 1880 his *Apuntes de Lógica, Cosmología y Psicología*. This work is not a course of Scholastic philosophy. As its title indicates, it simply consists of notes and observations destined to give to the students a clear intelligence of some obscure points of the text-book they were using. This text-book was Grandclaudé's *Breviarium Philosophiæ Scholasticæ*.

Rafael Cagigas (1864-1890), whose premature death has been a great loss to Mexican philosophical literature, manifests an enthusiastic admiration for the Thomistic doctrine, in his volume of works published in 1890. With the soul of a poet, the young writer studies the most abstruse philosophical doc-

trines. The theory of Matter and Form is for him a boundless harmony, which he sees reflected in the human mind. Cagigas is perhaps too severe for modern philosophy, as may be gathered from the following fragment of a speech he pronounced in the Catholic Circle of Mexico, on January 19, 1890:

"Modern philosophy, from Descartes to this day, is in a state of evident decay. She declares it herself with furious cries, appearing to the eyes of the crowd as a collection of all errors, as a sink of all filth, as the ruin of all spirits, as a labyrinth where the wisest man himself is suddenly confounded. What is morality in the cathedras, in the societies such a philosophy corrupts? The negative morality of the mule and of the ass."¹⁴

Secundino Briceño, besides an opuscle on the syllogism and a dissertation dealing with St. Thomas's doctrine about the Immaculate Conception, has written a comparative study of the Spencerian and Scholastic philosophy. The title of this work is *Ligeros Apuntes sobre la Filosofía de Spencer comparada con la Filosofía Escolástica*. Its aim is to oppose the powerful current of positivism which, due to the influence of Barrera and Porfirio Parra, has been for a long time the official philosophy in Mexico. Briceño limits his considerations to Spencer's First Principles, and skilfully points out the contradictions contained in the doctrine of the English philosopher.

An able representative of neo-Scholasticism in Mexico is the Dominican Guillermo García. A Spaniard by birth, now professor of dogmatic theology in the seminary of San Luis Potosí, Fr. García has written, besides a pamphlet on St. Bonaventure, a historical study entitled *Tomismo y Neotomismo*. The aim of this treatise is to give a full account of the works and the philosophical doctrines of Thomas Aquinas, to compare his philosophy with the modern currents of thought, to give a historical survey of the Thomistic philosophy throughout the ages. The part of the work dealing with modern philosophical systems has not much value. It is easy to see that Fr. García is not

¹⁴ In *Obras de R. Cagigas*, pp. 176 ff. Also given in Valverde's *Apuntaciones*, p. 402 ff.

precisely at home when he deals with Locke, Kant, Fichte and Hegel. His knowledge of St. Thomas, on the other hand, is certainly thorough. His admiration for the Angelic Doctor is even exaggerated. He feels proud of the rule of the Dominican order, which commands to follow St. Thomas in every point, *in omnibus, omnino*, under the most severe penalties, obliges to a vow of fidelity to his doctrines, and regards as impious the slightest deviation from them.¹⁵

Now, such a rule is not only unphilosophical, but anti-Thomistic. There is nothing more opposed to the spirit of a philosopher than a systematic and uncritical adherence to each proposition he has maintained. Philosophy is essentially a thinking study of things. We must carefully meditate the works of our predecessors, we must try to understand their meaning, to grasp their train of thought, but we are philosophers only in so far as we think with our own head. All great thinkers have studied the various philosophical systems, but they have not servilely adhered to them. They have marked their works with the seal of their own individuality. St. Thomas is no exception to this rule.

Happily for philosophy, the Dominicans do not seem to observe very strictly the rule of which Fr. García is so proud. Strange to say, García himself furnishes us ample proofs of this assertion. A section of *Tomismo y Neotomismo* is devoted to a defence of the Dominican order against the charge of intolerance. The author gives the names of notable members of the order who have more or less departed from St. Thomas's teaching without being molested. He speaks of Thomas de Vio Cajetanus, of Ambroso Catarino, of Thomas Campanella, and more especially of Durandus of St. Pourcain, a "powerful opponent of the philosophy of the Angelic Doctor," who lived and died in the Dominican order without ever suffering the slightest persecution.¹⁶

¹⁵ Cf. *Tomismo y Neotomismo*, p. 421.

¹⁶ García, *Tomismo y Neotomismo*, pp. 148 ff.

This is not the only contradiction which *Tomismo y Neotomismo* contains. Fr. García's position as regards neo-Scholasticism is far from being clear. He declares that his view of the Thomistic movement is in harmony with the view of the Louvain school, and he gives an excellent program of neo-Scholasticism to which every professor of Louvain would subscribe. On the other hand, he quotes with approval Cornoldi's famous phrase describing modern philosophy as the pathology of human reason, and cannot blame Orti y Lara for regarding modern thought as resting upon error and sin.

In spite of these defects, *Tomismo y Neotomismo* is a valuable little work. It contains important historical data about the Thomistic movement. The five chapters dealing with the philosophy of St. Thomas in the Dominican order are particularly interesting. Fr. García is actually preparing a treatise on St. Thomas's sociology. We sincerely hope that this new work will be, like *Tomismo y Neotomismo*, a precious contribution to neo-Scholastic literature.

No Mexican, however, deserves the thanks of all lovers of Scholastic philosophy so greatly as Mr. Valverde Tellez.

Emeterio Valverde Tellez, a canon of the cathedral of Mexico, has written, besides a treatise on truth, three historical works of great importance: the *Apuntaciones históricas sobre la Filosofía en México* (1896); the *Crítica Filosófica* (1904); and the *Bibliografía Filosófica Mexicana* (1907).

In the *Apuntaciones históricas*, Mr. Valverde, after general considerations on the nature of philosophy and a weak defense of Metaphysics against the attacks of Positivism, traces the great lines of Mexican speculation, gives valuable informations about the libraries and the centers of learning in Mexico, leads us through the vicissitudes of the Mexican University since its foundation in 1521 to its final suppression in 1868, and the foundation of the new Pontifical University in 1896. He then passes to a detailed and critical study of the various philosophi-

ical systems in his country. He analyzes the works and the doctrines of all great Mexican thinkers.

In spite of his enthusiastic admiration for St. Thomas, Mr. Valverde does full justice to the philosophers of other schools. His study of the recent positivistic movement in Mexico and of the violent discussions to which it has given rise is excellent.¹⁷

The *Crítica Filosófica* completes the *Apuntaciones* by furnishing new data, by making us know philosophical works completely unknown, and unearthed by the patient labor of the author.

The *Bibliografía Filosófica Mexicana* gives us, with the greatest exactitude, the list of all philosophical productions written in Mexico. Each work is preceded by a biographical sketch of its author and followed by a critical analysis, so that the *Bibliografía* is indispensable to all who are interested in the march of philosophical speculation among the Spanish race.

SECTION 4.—THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN SOUTH AMERICA

Among the countries which have eagerly embraced the cause of the Scholastic revival, Colombia deserves a special attention. Thomism has become, as it were, its official philosophy, and, more than anywhere else perhaps, has identified itself with the spirit of the nation.

When, in the middle of the last century, Bentham's utilitarian ethical system was introduced into Colombia, it was opposed by some of the most eminent Colombian writers. Margallo, M.M. Mallarino, Ricardo de la Parra, Joaquin Mosquera, Mario Valenzuela, and more especially José Eusebio Caro (1817-1853) and his illustrious son, Miguel Antonio Caro, defended the Thomistic moral system with much ability and success.

Miguel Antonio Caro, born in Bogotá on November 10, 1843, is chiefly known as a politician and a man of letters. As a politician, he has exercised an immense influence upon the gov-

¹⁷ The greatest supporter of Positivism in Mexico is Mr. Porfirio Parra. Its most irreducible adversary has been Mr. J. M. Vigil.

ernment of his country, and has been intrusted with the high office of president. Among his literary achievements, which have given him a conspicuous place in the history of Spanish literature, let us mention his admirable translation of Virgil into Spanish verse. His most lasting title to the gratitude of Philosophy is his *Estudio sobre el Utilitarismo*, which has been proclaimed worthy of Joseph de Maistre.¹⁸

The most important center of Thomism in Colombia is actually the College of the Rosary (Colegio Mayor de Nuestra Señora del Rosario) in Bogota.

As early as 1881, Rafael Maria Carrasquilla (born in Bogota on December 18, 1857, and president of the College of the Rosary since 1891) proclaimed his adherence to the philosophy imposed by Pope Leo XIII on the Catholic world. "To the modern errors," said he, "we must oppose the entire truth, even if we offend the pride of our century of progress, by exhibiting a monk of the thirteenth century as a model of wisdom."¹⁹

The program thus sketched by Mr. Carrasquilla has been faithfully carried out. All the works and essays the College has produced have been inspired by the purest Thomistic principles, so that the history of the College of the Rosary during the last fifteen years forms one of the most interesting pages of a history of neo-Scholasticism.

The adherence of the college to the principles of the Angelic Doctor does not, however, degenerate into servility. It is essentially eclectic and progressive. The new constitutions of the college strongly insist upon the fact that we must follow the Scholastics wherever their philosophy is acceptable in the light of modern criticism, and reject their doctrines if they have proved erroneous or inadequate.²⁰

The most important work of Mr. Carrasquilla is the volume entitled, *Ensayo sobre la doctrina liberal*, which has obtained

¹⁸ Cf. Ramirez, *Filosofia Positivista*, p. 95.

¹⁹ Carrasquilla, *Sobre el estudio de la filosofia*; Repert. Colomb., Aug., 1881.

²⁰ Cf. *Revista del Colegio del Rosario*, June, 1906, p. 316.

him the honor of being described as a "republican Balmes."

By its title, the *Ensayo sobre la Doctrina Liberal* seems to belong to political science rather than to philosophy. It is as a philosophical system, however, that Mr. Carrasquilla studies liberalism, which he refutes by the Thomistic social principles. "Liberalism," says he, "is above all a philosophical school, which a priest may study and refute with the same right where-with he would combat Descartes, Hegel or Rosmini."²¹

Among the men who have contributed to give to the College of the Rosary the Thomistic direction it has to-day, none is more conspicuous than Mr. Julian Restrepo Hernández, professor of logic and anthropology in the college since 1892.

Born in Bogotá on July 23, 1871, Julian Restrepo Hernández studied in the College of the Rosary and showed such philosophical acumen that he was placed in the chair of logic in 1890, while still a student in the college. Later on, he studied law and wrote for the Colombian government the *Codificación Cundinamarquesa*, which contains the entire legislation of Colombia, and forms a volume of 1208 pages folio.

Mr. Restrepo, however, has not neglected philosophy and has recently (1907) published a volume on logic (*Lecciones de Lógica*, in which he has embodied the lectures given to the students of the College of the Rosary.

The qualities which distinguish this work have been very skilfully pointed out by the distinguished literary critic Rufino José Cuervo, in a personal letter to the author: "The pleasure I experienced at the reading of your volume on Logic, says Mr. Cuervo, comes chiefly from the clearness, precision and rigorous method of the work, in which ancient and modern learning are combined, so that truth may appear more luminous and attractive."²²

Mr. Restrepo's Logic, besides its intrinsic value as an exposi-

²¹ Carrasquilla, *Ensayo sobre la Doctrina Liberal*, p. xiii.

²² Quoted in article by Pedro M. Carreño, in *La Prensa*, Bogotá, Dec. 14, 1907.

tion of the Scholastic logical principles, is worthy of attention for a theory of the modes of the hypothetical syllogism, which constitutes a direct contribution of the author to the field of logic.

Since 1905, the College of the Rosary also publishes an important review (*Revista del Colegio Mayor de Nuestra Señora del Rosario*) which is undoubtedly one of the most excellent South American periodical publications. Its field is not confined to philosophy. It treats likewise of literature, education, history, and seldom fails to give a delightful piece of poetry.

From a philosophical point of view, the most important contribution of the review is the essay entitled *Santo Tomás ante la ciencia moderna*, of Francisco Maria Rengifo, now professor in the college.

Mr. Rengifo studies the modern theories defended by mathematics and science and shows that they are in perfect harmony with the essential principles of Thomism.

Let us not leave the College of the Rosary without mentioning the interesting work entitled *La Filosofía Positivista*, written by Samuel Ramirez (1875-1908), as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. After giving a detailed history of the various positivistic schools, Mr. Ramirez demonstrates the superiority of the Thomistic principles over the doctrines of Comte and his disciples.

The Rev. Luis Ortiz, S.J., professor in the College of San Bartolomé, has contributed to Colombian neo-Scholastic literature a little work entitled *La Vida* (Life). The thesis defended by the author is the following: "The doctrine of the Angelic Doctor and of Fr. Suarez, defending the existence of a vital principle, which informs living beings and is essentially distinct from the physico-chemical forces of brute matter, is confirmed by the observations of modern science; or, more briefly, the physical and chemical forces are inadequate to explain life."

The proofs adduced by Fr. Ortiz in defence of this thesis are

a development of the following argument: The essences of things are known from the operations and properties of these things. The operations and properties of inorganic matter are essentially different from those which characterize living beings. Therefore, the nature of living beings is essentially different from that of inorganic matter.

Colombia is not the only South American republic in which the spirit of the Thomistic revival has penetrated. The most important contribution of South America to the cause of neo-Scholasticism came from Chile and was due to Francisco Ginebra, of the Society of Jesus.

Ginebra's *Elementos de Filosofia*, published in 1887 in Santiago (Chile), has deservedly run into several editions. It is one of the most valuable text-books on Scholastic philosophy which the neo-Scholastic revival has produced. The author has been chiefly inspired by St. Thomas, Suarez, Liberatore, Kleutgen, Cornoldi and Balmes.

The *Elementos de Filosofia* is completed by a treatise on Natural Law (*Elementos de Derecho Natural*), which is also a very important work, and has been adopted as a text-book in several of the South American schools of law.

CHAPTER XI

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN GERMANY, AUSTRIA AND SWITZERLAND

The philosophical systems of Kant and Hegel exercised a powerful influence upon Catholic philosophy in Germany. Georg Hermes (1775-1831) and Anton Günther (1783-1863) defended the omnipotence of human reason, and, following Hegel, rejected the distinction between natural and supernatural truths—one of the fundamental tenets of the Catholic Church. Rome condemned their doctrines and placed their writings on the Index, so that their efforts, from a Catholic point of view, were a failure.

A movement of return towards Thomistic philosophy then took place among German Catholic thinkers; so that, when Leo XIII published his encyclical, Catholic Germany eagerly espoused the views of the Pontiff.

Among the men who prepared this return to Scholasticism must be mentioned:

Friedrich Schlegel, who, in his *History of Ancient and Modern Literature*, showed the real merit of Mediæval philosophy.

Möhler and his disciple Staudenmaier, who condemned all forms of rationalism.

Clemens, whose aim was the refutation of Günther.

Rothenslue, who, in spite of some ontologistic and Rosminian ideas, agreed in the main with the philosophy of the School.

But the two philosophers who most actively contributed to the revival of Scholasticism in Germany were Kleutgen and Stöckl.

Joseph Kleutgen, S.J. (1811-1883), published in 1860 his *Philosophie der Vorzeit*, which has become one of the classical works of neo-Scholastic literature. The *Philosophie der Vorzeit*

is not, like Sanseverino's *Philosophia christiana* or Urraburu's *Institutiones*, a detailed course of Scholastic philosophy. It is rather a work of defense. Kleutgen is not the peaceful statesman who organizes his country; he is the general on the battlefield. His chief purpose is to purge German Catholic philosophy of all traces of Hegelianism. He vigorously attacks Hermes and Günther. He defends the Scholastic conceptions against the erroneous interpretations of Frohschammer, Malebranche and others.

He also expounds the fundamental principles of Thomism, and shows that they are the only principles capable of giving entire satisfaction to human reason.

Among Kleutgen's contributions to the body of Scholastic doctrines, let us mention his famous principles of knowledge, which have been generally accepted by subsequent neo-Thomists:

1. Knowledge results of the fact that an image of the known object is produced in the knower by the concourse of the known object and of the knower.

2. The known object is in the knower according to the mode of the knower.

3. Knowledge becomes more perfect in proportion as the knower is more remote, by the nature of his being, from material conditions.¹

Not long after the publication of the *Philosophie der Vorzeit*, Albert Stöckl (1823–1895) wrote his two most important works: *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (1864–66), and *Lehrbuch der Philosophie*. The latter is a clear and valuable exposition of the Thomistic philosophy; the former, one of the works which initiated those historical investigations about Scholasticism, of which the nineteenth century is so legitimately proud.

The most important contribution of Germany to Scholastic philosophy since the days of Kleutgen and Stöckl is the series

¹ Kleutgen, *La Philosophie scolastique*, Sierp's ed., Vol. 1, Dissert. 1. Chap. 1.

published under the name of *Philosophia Lacensis* by the Jesuits of Maria-Laaach. This series comprises the following works:

Institutiones logicales (3 vol.): *Institutiones philosophiæ naturalis*; and *Institutiones psychologicæ*, by Tilmann Pesch; *Institutiones theodicæ sive theologiæ naturalis*, by J. Hontheim; *Institutiones juris naturalis*, by Th. Meyer; eleven volumes in all, forming a complete course of Scholastic philosophy.

The *Philosophia Lacensis* is more decidedly Scholastic in its method than any other work neo-Thomism has produced. Fr. Pesch follows in his exposition the same plan St. Thomas followed. Like St. Thomas, he begins with an exposition of adverse doctrines, passes to the thesis containing his own views, ends with an answer to the objections given in the first part.

Such a method must not, however, lead us to believe that the eminent authors of the *Philosophia Lacensis* are servile followers of the Middle Ages and ignore modern ideas. Their acquaintance with the current of modern philosophy is remarkable. Fr. Pesch discusses all recent scientific hypotheses in his *Institutiones Philosophiæ Naturalis*, and tries to establish upon these hypotheses the foundation of Thomistic cosmology. A like knowledge of modern psychology appears in the *Institutiones Psychologicæ*.

Fathers Meyer and Hontheim follow the same method and display the same erudition. The latter has recently applied mathematics to logic in his work: *Der logische Algorithmus* (1895).

Besides Meyer, neo-Scholastic Germany possesses two moralists of a great merit, Costa-Rosetti (1841–1900) and Cathrein.

Victor Cathrein, S.J. (died 1899), published his *Moralphilosophie* in 1890, and gave it anew in a more concise form a few years afterwards, as one of the volumes of the series *Cursus philosophicus*, of which more in the sequel. One of the most important studies contained in Cathrein's work is the chapter dealing with Socialism. Published separately in German, and

honored by five editions in less than two years, it has been translated into English, French, Italian, Polish and Flemish. Although the author's conclusions are opposed to the socialistic theories, Socialists themselves have been compelled to admit that he had grasped the essential principles of their system more adequately than some of their own followers.

One of the greatest German neo-Scholastics of the present time is Mr. Constantin Gutberlet, professor in Fulda Seminary. As may be seen in our Bibliography, Mr. Gutberlet has studied the thought of the Angelic Doctor under all its aspects. Besides numerous shorter treatises, he published, between the years 1878 and 1884, the volumes of his *Lehrbuch der Philosophie*. This important work, in which the author generally follows Suarez, has been the first great successful attempt to harmonize modern science with Thomistic principles. Gutberlet's greatest service to the cause he defends has perhaps been the foundation of the review *Philosophisches Jahrbuch*, which, since 1888, has been read with avidity by all who are interested in the Scholastic revival. According to Mr. Picavet, the *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* is the most eclectic and the best informed of all neo-Scholastic periodical publications.

German neo-Scholastic literature possesses another review of great value, the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und speculative Theologie*. This review was founded in Paderborn in 1887 by Ernst Commer, professor in the University of Vienna. As its title indicates, it does not confine itself to philosophical questions. It often contains interesting theological discussions, and especially comparative studies of Catholic and Protestant theology.

Besides the *Jahrbuch*, Mr. Commer has published some important works, viz., *System der Philosophie, Logik, Die immerwährende Philosophie*, etc., which have given him the first rank among neo-Scholastics in Austria.

A third review, the *Saint-Thomasblätter*, published for some

years in Regensburg by Mr. C. M. Schneider, was more strictly Thomistic than the two other publications we have mentioned. Thomism, according to Mr. Schneider, must be accepted in its entirety or not be accepted at all. This principle inspired the *Saint-Thomasblätter*, and recurs in all the works Mr. Schneider has published.

Germany has distinguished itself, more than any other nation, by important works concerning the history of philosophy in the Middle Ages. We have already spoken of Albert Stöckl. Not long afterwards, Carl Werner published important monographs dealing with the doctrine of all the great Mediæval thinkers. Aleuin, Albert the Great, William of Auvergne, Roger Bacon, St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Suarez, were studied with untiring zeal and incredible erudition.

Some years later, Ehrle and Henry Denifle, O.P. (died 1905), published the *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, which made known many an unknown text, and enriched neo-Scholastic literature with numerous learned studies. Denifle also wrote a *History of the Universities in the Middle Ages*, which is the most precious work we possess on the subject. This History gave its author such a fame that the French Academy invited him to write a *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, which he completed (1891) with the coöperation of A. Chatelain.

More directly concerned with philosophy than Denifle's contributions are the important works of Clemens Baeumker and Baron G. V. von Hertling, published, since 1891, under the title of *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*. The collection consists of works heretofore unpublished, critical editions of works already known, monographs, etc. Among the works it already contains let us mention: the *De Unitate* of Dominicus Gonzalez, falsely attributed to Boethius, the *Pons Vitæ* of the Jewish philosopher Ibn Gebirol, the Theory of Knowledge of William of Auvergne, the *Impossibilia* of Siger

de Brabant, Mr. Grabman's learned study on Cardinal Matthew of Aquasparta, etc.²

Besides this most important contribution to neo-Scholastic literature, Mr. Baemker has published: *Das Problem der Materie in der griechischen Philosophie* (1890).

In German Switzerland, the most important center of neo-Thomism is the Catholic University of Friburg, in which the classes of philosophy and theology have been confided to the Dominican Fathers. Among the eminent men who have taught in the university may be mentioned Coconnier, Berthier and Mandonnet.

The most distinguished neo-Scholastic in Switzerland is not, however, connected with Friburg University. It is the Rev. Nicolas Kaufmann, president of the Academy of St. Thomas of Lucern. Mr. Kaufmann has contributed numerous articles to the *Revue Neo-Scholastique*, the *Philosophisches Jahrbuch*, and several Swiss periodicals, and has published many valuable works dealing with particular aspects of the philosophy of Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas (cf. Bibliography). One of the best known is his study on Final Cause, which has been translated into French. In articles published in the *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung*, especially in the article entitled: *Das Pontificat Leos XIII und der Neuthomismus*, Kaufmann has shown that his view of the neo-Thomistic movement is identical with the view of Leo XIII, and may be expressed by the famous formula: *vetera novis augere*.

A complete history of neo-Scholasticism in German-speaking countries would be very extensive. Our rapid survey, incomplete though it be, must not omit the names of the following distinguished men:

Mathias Schneid (1840-1895) who, besides a work on the influence of Aristotle upon the Scholastics, *Aristoteles in der Scholastik*, published in 1875, and inspired by Talamo's work

² The works belonging to this collection are indicated in our Bibliography by the word Beiträge.

on the same subject, has written valuable studies on the cosmological theories of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus.

Ludwig Schütz (1838–1901), whose most important contribution to neo-Scholastic literature is a vocabulary known as *Thomas-Lexicon*, in which all scientific terms contained in the *Summa Theologica* and the *Summa contra Gentiles* are thoroughly explained.

Francis Xavier Pfeifer (1829–1902), who has tried to harmonize the Thomistic philosophy with the recent scientific hypotheses in his work *Harmonische Beziehung zwischen Scholastik und moderner Naturwissenschaft*.

Otto Willmann, professor in the University of Prague, and author of a remarkable *History of Idealism*.

Joseph Jungmann, S.J., the author of one of the best works dealing with esthetics (*Ästhetik*, Freiburg, 1884), in which he finds in Scholastic psychology the foundation of the notion of the beautiful.

Francis Schaub, the author of a comparative study of the Thomistic and socialistic theories.

Eugene Rolfes, who has compared the theistic conceptions of St. Thomas and Aristotle, and has tried to discover in the Greek philosopher some traces of the Christian dogmas.

Gundisalv. Feldner, who has published a study about St. Thomas's teaching concerning free will.

Michael Glossner, canon of München, one of the best known contributors to the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und speculative Theologie*.

Martin Grabmann, who, besides the learned study on Matthew of Aquasparta we have already mentioned, has published an excellent treatise on the idea of God in St. Thomas's philosophy.

CHAPTER XII

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN FRANCE

Although France contributed perhaps more than any other nation to turn the attention of the world to the Middle Ages, the direct current of the Thomistic revival had at first little or no influence upon French speculation. The philosophical systems of Descartes and Cousin were deeply rooted upon the French soil. Even in Catholic seminaries, the doctrines of the two great French philosophers were officially taught. The textbook most in use at the time, and whose pages breathe a strong Cartesian spirit, had been written by Father Valla in the last years of the preceding century, and was generally known as *Philosophie de Lyon*. The full title of the work is: *Institutiones philosophicæ, auctoritate D.D. Archiepiscopi Lugdunensis, 1792*. Even after the promulgation of the encyclical *Æterni Patris*, eclecticism and Cartesianism kept their ground for a long time among French Catholics. This easily explains how France had not a single great representative of neo-Scholasticism at the time Germany could mention with pride the works of Kleutgen; Spain, those of Cardinal Gonzalez; Italy, those of Sanseverino, Liberatore and Talamo.

The works published in France in defense of Scholasticism previous to the encyclical *Æterni Patris* are few and of little importance. Let us mention the *Prima Principia Scientiarum* of Michael Rosset (1866); the *Breviarium Philosophiæ Scholasticæ* of Grandelaude (1868); the short treatise entitled, *De l'union substantielle de l'âme et du corps*, published in 1870 by Henri Sauvé, president of the Catholic University of Angers; the *Doctrine de la Connaissance*, of Mgr. Bourquard, of the same university, published seven years later; and the treatise

De intellectualismo of the Sulpician P.M. Brin (1843-1894), which has served as a basis to Farges and Barbedette for the Manual of Scholastic philosophy they have recently written (*Philosophia scholastica ad mentem Sancti Thomæ Aquinatis exposita*).

These modest efforts did not fall upon a barren ground. The work of the first pioneers was completed by eminent followers, so that to-day France is second to no other nation in the number and worth of the productions wherewith neo-Scholastic literature has been enriched.

As early as 1875, Count Domet de Vorges wrote his *Métaphysique en présence des sciences*, a small work in which the eminent author already evinces a tendency which characterizes his subsequent writings, namely the attempt to show the harmony existing between Aristotelian metaphysics and scientific results.

Mr. Domet de Vorges is one of the most distinguished representatives of neo-Scholasticism in France. For more than thirty years he has defended, with unflagging energy, the great cause of which, so early in life, he proclaimed himself a champion. In union with Mgr. d'Hulst, he founded the Parisian Society of St. Thomas. He has published many important works, and has been one of the most assiduous collaborators of some Catholic reviews, especially of the *Annales de Philosophie chrétienne* and the *Revue de Philosophie*. His most valuable productions are his *Essai de Métaphysique positive* (1883), in which he professes that Aristotelian metaphysics is a true science, and, like all other sciences, is founded upon the facts of experience; and his *Abrégé de Métaphysique* (1906), especially interesting for the method it follows. For each problem, Mr. de Vorges brings all solutions proposed by Mediæval philosophers. After a learned comparison and discussion, he gives his preference to one of them or proposes a solution of his own. This historical method cannot be too much praised. It brings

before our eyes the whole body of Scholastic philosophy. It makes us enter into the very spirit of the Middle Ages.

Among the early defenders of neo-Thomism in France, we must also mention the Sulpician P. Vallet. His *Prælectiones Philosophiæ ad mentem S. Thomæ Aquinatis*, published in 1879, has been translated into several languages and honored by numerous editions. Mr. Vallet has also written numerous shorter treatises (cf. Bibliography), which have assured him a conspicuous rank among French neo-Scholastics. As a philosopher he is, however, greatly surpassed by another Sulpician, Mr. Albert Farges.

Farges's greatest contribution to neo-Scholastic literature consists of a series of works published under the title of *Etudes Philosophiques*. The series comprises the following treatises: I, *Théorie fondamentale de l'acte et de la puissance, du moteur et du mobile*; II, *Matière et Forme en présence des sciences modernes*; III, *La vie et l'évolution des espèces*; IV, *Le cerveau, l'âme et les facultés*; V, *L'objectivité de la perception des sens externes et les théories modernes*; VI, *L'idée de continu dans l'espace et dans le temps*; VII, *L'idée de Dieu d'après la raison et la science*; VIII, *La liberté et le devoir*; IX, *La crise de la certitude*.

In these works Mr. Farges expounds and defends the fundamental principles of Scholastic philosophy. He does not fear to put Mediæval theories in close contact with the most recent scientific discoveries. He finds in natural science the proof of the doctrine of Matter and Form. His conclusions as regards the constitution of bodies have been discussed in our chapter on Cosmology. Although some of them are evidently inadmissible, Mr. Farges cannot be denied a high rank among neo-Scholastics. One of his admirers, William Garcia, goes so far as to give him the very first place.

A third Sulpician, G. Bulliat, less known than Vallet and Farges, has lately published a *Thesaurus Philosophiæ Thomisticæ* (1899), in which all philosophical doctrines scattered in

the works of St. Thomas are brought together. The work exclusively consists of extracts from the writings of the Angelic Doctor.

The man who could dispute with Farges the first place among French neo-Scholastics is Mr. Elie Blane, professor of philosophy in the Catholic University of Lyon.

Elie Blane is a writer of remarkable fecundity. Having completed a few years ago his *Dictionnaire universel de la pensée*, a masterly work, which may be described as a natural and philosophical classification of words, ideas and things, he undertook an immense Encyclopedia, which, when completed, will be one of the most imposing monuments of the French language. This work, whose title is: *Systèmes des connaissances humaines. Encyclopédie chrétienne et française du XX. siècle*, will consist of one hundred volumes octavo. The first fifty will treat of the different branches of human knowledge; the next twenty will be devoted to geography; the last thirty to history.

Among Mr. Blane's numerous productions the following are most especially devoted to philosophy:

Traité de la Philosophie scolastique, published in 1889, and recently translated into Latin with the title, *Manuale Philosophiæ Scholasticæ*.

Histoire de la Philosophie et particulièrement de la Philosophie contemporaine, very valuable for the indications it contains about contemporary philosophers.

Dictionnaire de Philosophie ancienne, moderne et contemporaine (1906).

Opuscules philosophiques, containing studies about the philosophy of Vacherot, the Ethics of Spencer, the question of free will, etc.

Mélanges philosophiques, essays first published in *l'Univers Catholique* between the years 1897 and 1900, and in which the author clearly follows the movement of modern thought.

Mr. Blane also wrote, with the collaboration of Mr. Vaganay, a Bibliography of the works recently published in French and

Latin. Finally, he founded in 1903 an important review, *la Pensée contemporaine*, which has already given many interesting articles in defense of the principles of Scholasticism.

Blanc, Farges and Domet de Vorges, with the Jesuits Delmas and De Régnon, of whom more in the sequel, are the most distinguished representatives of neo-Scholasticism in France. Of equal or scarcely inferior merit are Gardair, the Marist Peillaube, and the Dominicans Coconnier, Sertillanges, Maumus and Mandonnet.

Mr. J. Gardair opened in the Sorbonne in 1890 a free course on the philosophy of St. Thomas. His lectures have been subsequently published with the following titles: *Corps et Ame* (1892); *Les Passions et la Volonté* (1892); *La Connaissance* (1895); *La Nature humaine* (1896); and form a complete course of Scholastic philosophy. The author closely follows the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, and adheres to the doctrine of the Angelic Doctor even in some points in which this doctrine has been commonly abandoned. He defends, for example, the Thomistic view that the human fetus passes through a series of stages in which it is successively informed by the vegetative, the sensitive and the intellectual soul.¹ Like Mr. Farges, Mr. Gardair has purposely neglected many unimportant points, and devoted his attention to the most essential Scholastic doctrines.

The Marist Peillaube is a Thomist of the new school, and, like Farges and the professors of Louvain, does not hesitate to study the Thomistic principles side by side with the most recent philosophical theories. This position was already taken in his *Théorie des concepts*, a thesis he defended before the Catholic University of Toulouse in 1895 for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It has been adhered to in the *Revue de Philosophie*, published by Mr. Peillaube since 1900, and justly regarded as one of the best philosophical reviews we possess to-day.

Two other Marists of great merit are Bulliot, of whom Peil-

¹ Cf. Gardair, *La Nature humaine*, pp. 345 ff.

laube has been the disciple, and Ragey, the author of remarkable works on St. Anselm.

The Dominican order has furnished to the cause of neo-Scholasticism some of its most valiant defenders. St. Thomas Aquinas was a Dominican and has always been a favorite author in Dominican studies. The Dominicans are proud of their great saint, and regard themselves—probably with justice—as his most faithful interpreters. We have already studied the works of Zigliara in Italy and of Gonzalez in Spain.

In France the Dominicans have done immense service to the cause of neo-Scholasticism by the publication of the *Revue thomiste*, founded in Paris in 1893. The *Revue thomiste* studies theology side by side with philosophy, and contains interesting dissertations about the true meaning of the Angelic Doctor. It is regarded by Mr. Picavet as the most important periodical publication of neo-Scholastic literature.

The Dominican Coconnier is chiefly known for his work *l'Hypnotisme franc* (1897), in which he attacks the ideas expressed by the Italian Jesuit Franco in another work written on the same subject some years before (*l'Ipnatismo tornato di modo*, 1886). Fr. Coconnier excludes from "frank hypnotism" all facts of immediate transmission of ideas, telepathy, intuition of the thoughts of other people, vision of the future, etc. He then teaches that hypnotism thus understood is not necessarily supernatural.

Besides this work, with which Scholastic philosophy is not directly concerned, Coconnier has published a treatise on the human soul (1890), in which he studies modern psychological theories.

A. D. Sertillanges has chiefly diseussed the problem of God. For many years he has been as assiduous collaborator of several philosophical reviews, such as the *Revue thomiste* and the *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, and has proved himself to be one of the most profound interpreters of the Angelic Doctor.

V. Maumus, in *Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la Philosophie cartésienne*, has made a comparative study of the Cartesian and Thomistic philosophy, in which he naturally prefers St. Thomas. One year later, in *Les Philosophes contemporains*, he has judged very severely Vacherot, Taine, Janet, Caro and Schopenhauer. He is especially antipathetic to Schopenhauer, whom he charges with having dishonored the history of philosophy.

Pierre Mandonnet owes a well-deserved reputation to the work, *Siger de Brabant et l'Averroïsme latin au XIII. siècle*, which contains very important data about the great currents of thought of the thirteenth century, and has been greatly praised by Delacroix, in the *Revue de Synthèse historique* (August, 1902), and by Gomez Izquierdo, in his *History of Philosophy in the XIX. century*. Mandonnet has made on Mediæval topics other important studies, which have appeared in the *Revue thomiste*. Let us mention the essay entitled, *Jean Scot Erigène et Jean le Sourd*, published in 1897.

Other Dominicans worthy of notice are: Hugon, who has recently (1906-7) published the first two volumes of a course of Scholastic philosophy; De Munynck, who has refuted the objections raised against moral liberty from the theory of the conservation of energy; Gardeil, who has written interesting articles on neo-Scotism; Berthier, Montagne, Folghera, etc.

The two greatest works with which the French Jesuits have enriched neo-Scholastic literature are: the *Métaphysique des Causes* of Fr. de Régnon and the *Ontologia* of Fr. Delmas.

Born in Saint-Herblain (Loire Inférieure) on October 11, 1832, Théodore de Régnon entered the Society of Jesus in 1852. He taught mathematics and physical science in the College of the Immaculate Conception and in the school of Sainte-Geneviève (Paris), and died in Vaugirard on December 26, 1893.

During the time he was engaged in teaching, he carefully studied the great Scholastic doctors, so that, when the laws of 1880 separated him from his chair, he was in possession of

important materials which allowed him to complete in a short time considerable philosophical and theological works.

The most important of De Régnon's philosophical productions is his *Métaphysique des Causes*.

The aim of the author is very modest. He simply wishes to lay before the students of St. Thomas the philosophical notions without which a thorough understanding of the Angelic Doctor cannot be attained: "To make clear the notion of cause by separating it from adjacent notions, to show how the influence of the cause expands into distinct causalities, to explain the nature of these different causalities and their correlation; finally, to show unity and harmony in the action of these different causes: such is my aim. It is a rational plan to contain the great maxims concerning causes, which constantly recur in the treatises of our doctors. It is a preparatory study which may be useful to those who wish to understand St. Thomas in St. Thomas himself."²

With what perfection Fr. de Régnon has carried out the plan thus sketched in his Introduction may be gathered from the eulogistic testimonials of several eminent philosophers. Ollé-Laprune, while teaching at the *Ecole Normale Supérieure*, would often direct his students to the *Métaphysique des Causes* as to a masterpiece. Georges Fonsegrive, in his *Cours de Philosophie*, pronounces De Régnon's work learned and profound.³ Bishop Maurice d'Hulst calls the distinguished Jesuit "un métaphysicien de premier ordre."⁴

Charles Delmas published in 1896 an extensive treatise on Scholastic metaphysics, entitled *Ontologia Metaphysica generalis*. All questions concerning ontology are treated with the greatest minuteness. The author follows St. Thomas, Suarez and modern Scholastics, especially those belonging to the Society

² *Métaphysique des Causes*, Introduction, pp. 14-15.

³ Cf. Fonsegrive, *Elements de Philosophie*, vol. 2, p. 247, note 1.

⁴ Cf. Mgr. d'Hulst, *Conférences de Notre-Dame*, p. 370; Paris, Pousielgue, 1891,

of Jesus. Fr. Delmas sides with Suarez rather than with St. Thomas whenever a divergence exists between the two great doctors. He thus maintains with Suarez that the distinction between the essence and the existence of created beings is not real, but virtual.⁵ It is perhaps on account of this preference that the *Ontologia* has been described as a *summula Suarezii*. Fr. Delmas's work is not, however, a mere compendium of Suarez's *Metaphysica*. It studies the doctrines of Kant, Locke, Hume, and other modern philosophers. These considerations about modern systems are probably the weakest part of Delmas's work. I doubt whether any student of Kant would recognize the philosophy of the Critique as portrayed in the pages 19-22 of the *Ontologia*.

Among other writers who have served with distinction the cause of neo-Scholasticism in France let us mention:

Jules Didiot (1840-1903), who has taught for twenty-five years in the Catholic University of Lille. His most important contribution to philosophy is: *Contribution philosophique à l'étude des sciences* (1902). He has also made, in the volume entitled *Un Siècle*, a rapid survey of the philosophical movement of the world during the nineteenth century.

J. M. A. Vacant (1851-1901), professor in the seminary of Nancy. Vacant, although primarily a theologian, has written numerous works or essays concerning philosophy (cf. Bibliography). Most important among them are his comparative studies of the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus.

Prosper de Martigné, a member of the Franciscan order, famous by a work entitled, *La Scolastique et les traditions françaises*, in which he studies Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure, Richard of Middleton and Duns Scotus.

A. Clerval, of the diocese of Chartres, author of remarkable researches about the school of Chartres in the Middle Ages.

Clément Besse, professor in the *Institut Catholique de Paris*, who, besides valuable articles published in the *Revue Neo-*

⁵ Cf. Delmas, *Ontologia*, pp. 183 ff.

Scholastic and dealing with morality in France, and the volume, *Philosophie et Philosophes*, has recently written a historical study entitled: *Deux centres du mouvement thomiste, Rome et Louvain* (1902). Mr. Besse has been reproached with having been unduly severe for Roman neo-Thomism. The characteristic traits of the two great neo-Scholastic schools are, however, faithfully delineated in his work. The chief merit of *Deux centres du mouvement thomiste* is the historical data it contains about early Roman Thomism, which have been of great service to all subsequent historians of the neo-Scholastic movement.

Carra de Vaux, professor at the *Institut Catholique de Paris*, who has published interesting studies about Arabian philosophers.

Victor Bernies, author of the work, *Spiritualité et Immortalité* (1901), which has met with great success, and of a series of articles on the "active intellect," whose existence he has denied.

P. Mielle, professor of philosophy in the seminary of Langres, who published in 1894 a dissertation entitled, *De substantia corporalis vi et ratione*, greatly praised by Picavet;⁶ and, more recently (1898), the treatise, *La Matière première et l'étendue*, in which he expounds and disusses the opinions of the great Scholastic philosophers about primordial matter, and agrees with Thomas Aquinas in regarding it as the principle of individuation of the bodily substance.

Some French writers of great merit, although less strictly Scholastic than those we have studied, have defended the essential principles of Thomistic philosophy. Most distinguished among them are Mgr. d'Hulst, Clodius Piat and Georges Fonsegrive.

Maurice d'Hulst (1841-1896), successor of Monsabré in Notre-Dame and first rector of the Catholic University of Paris, is primarily an orator. He has served the cause of neo-Scholasticism by a series of articles which he has later collected and

⁶ Cf. *Rev. Philos.*, Jan., 1896, p. 61.

published in the volume *Mélanges philosophiques*. The volume contains: three opening lessons of a free course of philosophy given from 1880 to 1883, three series of lectures given to the public, and articles published in the *Correspondant* and the *Annales de Philosophie chrétienne*.

Clodius Piat, professor at the *Institut Catholique of Paris*, was first known for a memoir on the active intellect, written in 1891, which he published, with greater development, in 1896, and entitled *l'Idée*. In this work Mr. Piat examines and criticizes empiricism, ontologism, and the theory of innate ideas, and insists upon the essential distinction between the idea and the phantasm. In *La Liberté* (1894-95) he discusses all modern theories about freedom, and defends the freedom of the will on the grounds of the direct testimony of consciousness and of the moral law. Besides these two great works and two others of no less interest: *la Personne humaine* (1897) and *Destinée de l'homme* (1898), Mr. Piat has contributed numerous articles to several philosophical reviews, and the volume *Socrate* (1900) to the collection *Série des grands philosophes*. He is one of the most distinguished Catholic philosophers of the present day.

Georges Fonsegrive is one of the most conspicuous among French publicists. He founded in 1896 the review *La Quinzaine*, which has actively served for eleven years (till March, 1907) the cause of Catholicism. Mr. Fonsegrive has defended the fundamental Scholastic principles in his *Essai sur le libre arbitre* (1887), crowned by the Academy of Moral and Political Science, and in a second treatise, *La Causalité efficiente* (1893), in which he exposes the origin of the idea of efficient cause and defends its validity.

It would be unjust not to mention here Mr. Francois Picavet, born in Petit-Fayt (Nord) in 1851, and actually professor in the department of *Hautes-Etudes* at the Sorbonne. A primary school teacher at first, Mr. Picavet has risen, through his own merit, to the high place he now occupies in the educational field. His contributions to philosophy are numerous and display the

greatest erudition. Of special interest are his studies on Scholasticism. They consist of articles published in the *Revue Philosophique*, of learned monographs on Gerbert, Abelard, and other Mediaeval writers, and of a more extensive work, the *Esquisse d'une histoire générale et comparée des philosophies médiévales*, which has met with a great success, and of which we have already spoken. Mr. Picavet does not study Scholastic philosophy with the spirit which has inspired the neo-Thomistic revival. He is not, and does not pretend to be a Scholastic. He has nevertheless contributed more than any other writer to impose the neo-Scholastic revival upon the attention of French philosophers.

We have mentioned the reviews *Revue thomiste*, *Revue de Philosophie* and *La Pensée contemporaine*. Neo-Scholasticism owes also some gratitude to the *Annales de Philosophie chrétienne*, which was the first organ of the Thomistic revival. The *Annales* has recently modified its direction and manifested a marked sympathy for the Kantian philosophy.

CHAPTER XIII

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN BELGIUM

Ontologism, or the doctrine of the direct intuition of the Deity, was the system in vogue in Belgian philosophic circles by the middle of the nineteenth century. Ubaghs's philosophy, as is well known, is directly inspired by Malebranche, whose principles it faithfully reproduces. Similar beliefs were professed by Ubaghs's co-workers at the University of Louvain: Laforet, Claessens and Moeller.

This tendency of Belgian thought did not, however, preserve for a long time its original force. After ontologism had been condemned by the Church in 1861, Ubaghs's philosophy was gradually abandoned, and a return to St. Thomas began to take place. Among the professors of the University of Louvain who contributed to bring about this return let us mention Dupont, Bossu, and Lefebvre.

No man, however, worked more bravely for the final victory of Scholasticism than the Dominican Lepidi, then prefect of studies in the College of the Immaculate Conception of Louvain, later professor at the Minerva in Rome.

An Italian by birth, Lepidi belongs to Belgium by his philosophy, not only because he wrote there his most important works, but chiefly for the immense influence he exercised upon Belgian thought by bringing about the downfall of Ontologism.

A solid refutation of ontologism is indeed the work entitled *Examen philosophico-theologicum de ontologismo*. The author not only shows that the theory of the Divine Vision is groundless, but he proves that the passages from St. Augustine and St. Thomas generally adduced by ontologists in support of their views are not, when properly understood, favorable to ontologism.

No less recommendable is Lepidi's *Elementa Philosophiæ christianæ* (1875-79). It contains a clear and methodic exposition of Scholastic logic and metaphysics, and may be regarded as one of the best contributions to neo-Scholastic literature written previous to the encyclical *Æterni Patris*.

A distinguished worker of the first hour was also Van Weddingen, chaplain of the court. His first work, *Essai critique sur la philosophie de saint Anselme* (1875), was crowned by the Royal Academy of Brussels. Proposed by Leo XIII to teach philosophy in the University of Louvain, he declined the offer, preferring to keep his functions at the court, but he powerfully contributed by his writings to give to the Thomistic revival a sure footing in Belgium. Besides a commentary on the encyclical *Æterni Patris*, in which he splendidly sets down the program of neo-Thomism, and important treatises on St. Anselm, Albert the Great and St. Thomas (cf. Bibliography), Van Weddingen has given to neo-Scholastic literature an extensive work, his *Essai d'introduction à l'étude de la philosophie*, which consists of no less than 900 pages quarto, and studies the question of the objectivity of knowledge, a question to which the *Critique of Pure Reason* has given a capital importance.

The neo-Scholastic revival in Belgium has been chiefly fostered by two great centers of learning: the College of the Jesuits of Louvain and the *Institut Supérieur de Philosophie*.

The most celebrated among Belgian Jesuits are De San, Lahousse, Castelein, Van der Aa, and Carbonelle.

Louis de San (1832-1904) is reputed as one of the most profound thinkers the Society of Jesus has produced. For more than thirty years he taught philosophy and theology at Louvain. His theological productions are numerous. Unhappily, he has contributed to philosophy a single volume on cosmology, one of the four volumes of a work entitled: *Institutiones metaphysicæ specialis*, which the learned Jesuit had in view, but never completed.

De San is thoroughly acquainted with modern philosophy.

He has mastered Spinoza and the German idealists. He possesses a remarkable knowledge of natural science, studies the Scholastic cosmological theories in connection with the laws of chemistry, and finds in chemistry itself the proof of the Thomistic principles.

Gustave Lahousse (born 1846) is less profound than De San and less acquainted with modern philosophy. His *Prælectiones* at times even display a lack of logical method. In his *Cosmology*, for example, he first demonstrates the existence of bodies, and next the objectivity of sensation.

John Van der Aa (born 1843) is strictly Scholastic and ignores many modern problems. In his *Logic* he reduces induction to syllogism.

Much more modern in his method, much more familiar with the spirit of our time, is Aug. Castelein (born 1840), whose *Cours de Philosophie* (1887), and *Institutiones philosophiæ moralis et socialis* (1889) have been valuable contributions to neo-Scholastic literature. Unlike Van der Aa, he does not limit himself to the classical Scholastic logic, but studies the inductive process, and discusses the value of hypothesis and of experimental methods. In his *Psychology*, Fr. Castelein examines the Scholastic teaching about the soul in connection with modern physiological data.

Ignatius Carbonelle (died 1889) is primarily a scientist. Like Fr. Castelein, he tries to harmonize scientific discoveries with the Scholastic principles. His work *Les confins de la science et de la philosophie* has been honored by several editions. Carbonelle has directed the *Revue des Questions scientifiques*, one of the most important Belgian publications.

Although the Jesuit College is thus an important center of neo-Thomism, the city of Louvain is justly proud of another center incomparably more important, of a center which has raised neo-Thomism to an immense height, has transformed its character and method, giving it a new life, bringing it into con-

tact with modern progress and modern ideals. It is the *Institut Supérieur de Philosophie* of the University.

The peculiar character which distinguishes the Institute of Louvain from earlier centers of Thomism is chiefly due to the initiative of its first president, Desiré Mercier.

Born in Braine l'Alleud (Belgium) in 1851, Desiré Mercier began his studies in the seminary of Malines, and completed them in the University of Louvain. He was subsequently given the chair of philosophy in the seminary of Malines. This was precisely the time in which Leo XIII, having been elected pope, was promoting in Italy the revival of Scholasticism. Cornoldi was then giving his famous course, silencing all opponents with the authority of St. Thomas, resolving all scientific doubts by the *Summa Theologica*.

Leo XIII who, when a young man, had inhabited Belgium as a papal nuncio, and had kept of that country the most delightful remembrance, was trying to make the neo-Thomistic revival step beyond the limits of Italy, to create in some other country an institution similar to the Roman College, to the Cornoldi school. Nowhere could he find a more favorable ground than in Belgium. By the brief of the twenty-fifth of December, 1880, addressed to Cardinal Deschamps, archbishop of Malines, the pope urgently recommended the foundation of a chair of Thomistic philosophy in the University of Louvain. So great was then the renown of the young professor Mercier, so successfully had he fulfilled in Malines his professorial duties, that he was chosen to carry the papal designs into effect.

The success was great. It did not, however, satisfy the pope, who understood that something still greater could be done. A few years later—the eleventh of July, 1888—Leo XIII sent a second brief to the archbishop of Malines, Cardinal Goossens, recommending the foundation of an institute of Thomistic philosophy, endowed with its own independent life. Having learned that the greatest difficulty was the lack of funds, he sent to Cardinal Goossens the sum of 150,000 francs. Great was the

energy displayed by the Belgian Catholics to realize the papal ideals. Their efforts were finally crowned with success, and in 1891 the Institute of Philosophy of Louvain, the glory of neo-Thomism, was officially created.

In a memoir read before the Congress of Catholics held in Malines in September, 1891, Mercier traced the program he had in view to insure the success of the new foundation. After representing and deploring the isolation from the rest of the scientific world to which Catholics had condemned themselves, he outlined the reforms he contemplated, the new road he intended to open to neo-Scholasticism.

The reforms which characterized the school of Louvain may be classified under two heads:

1. Philosophy was not to be regarded as a mere *ancilla theologiæ*, but to be studied for philosophy's sake. Catholic philosophers would thus frankly enter into the spirit of our time, and cease to be looked upon as mere apologists of their Creed.

2. Just as philosophy was to be studied for its own sake, so also was science. Neo-Thomists had to become true scientists, to construct laboratories, to make experiments, and—this was the point which at first savored of paradox—to find in St. Thomas himself the reconciliation of science and philosophy.

This last ambition was not novel. It was the very aim Cornoldi had cherished many years before, the very spirit which had inspired the encyclical *Æterni Patris*, but thus far nothing serious had been done.

Mercier proposed: first of all, to study St. Thomas in his original works, to open the *Summa Theologica*, the *Summa contra Gentiles*, the *Opuscula Philosophica*, the *Commentaria in Aristoteles*. It was thus found that a great many opinions which, for centuries, had been ridiculed under the name of Thomism, were not from St. Thomas, but from writers of the time of the Renaissance, from Newton or Gassendi. It was found that Aristotle and St. Thomas were not dogmatic idealists constructing the world *a priori*, but true scientists, who based

their philosophy upon the facts of experience; that their doctrines were not antiquated and useless theories, but possessed a character of modernness which many recent systems might envy.

Modern philosophers were likewise to be studied in their original works. Descartes and Kant were not to be reached any longer *via* Sanseverino. The *Discourse on Method* and the *Critique of Pure Reason* were to be read and understood. Thus and thus only could the spirit of modern philosophy be grasped; thus only could neo-Thomism keep abreast with the rest of the learned world.

The success of the Institute of Louvain has been prodigious. Mgr. Mercier has found at first many opponents among Catholics,¹ but he has always answered victoriously. The numerous articles on neo-Thomism which, since the foundation of the Institute, have appeared in the *Kantstudien*, the *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie*, the *Revue Philosophique*, the *Rivista Filosofica*, and many other publications, show how well he has succeeded in breaking the studied silence with which the Thomistic revival had been previously received.

The Institute of Louvain, so successful in point of philosophy, has also obtained significant results in the field of science. At the head of the department of science is Mr. Thiéry, a former pupil of the famous Wundt, of Leipzig. About the laboratory he has founded in Louvain, Mr. Binet could write in the *Année Psychologique* of 1896: "For the course of Mr. Thiéry there is a laboratory and complete equipment for physiological psychology such as does not exist at present in all France." A similar laboratory has been subsequently founded at the Sorbonne (Hautes-Études).

Under the direction of Mgr. Mercier, a Course of Philosophy has been published to which Mercier himself has contributed the volumes on *Logic*, *Criteriaology*, *General Metaphysics*, and *Psychology*. Less extensive than the *Institutiones* of Urraburn, Mercier's Course is much more modern. It discards questions

¹ Cf. Billia, *L'esiglio di San Agostino*, Torino, 1899.

which in our day may be dismissed as useless, and studies scientific results in themselves, without giving, at the head of each chapter, a decision of the Councils or a passage from the Sacred Scriptures, with which the data of science must be forced into harmony.

The success of the "*Cours de Philosophie*" of the Institute is eloquently testified by the numerous editions which have been made in a few years, and the translations into German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and Polish by which it has been honored.

The Catholic Church has not been indifferent to the great service done by Mereier to the cause of neo-Thomism. The illustrious founder of the Institute of Louvain has been offered in 1906 the archiepiscopal see of Malines. Quite recently (April 18, 1907) he has been made a cardinal.

The arduous task that lay before Mereier in 1891 has been greatly facilitated by the action of distinguished collaborators who at once grasped the program of their master and imbibed his spirit. Conspicuous among them is the illustrious historian of Mediæval philosophy, Mr. de Wulf.

Maurice de Wulf (born 1867) was already known before his appointment at Louvain by a historical work: *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique dans les Pays-Bas et la Principauté de Liège*, which had been crowned by the Royal Academy of Belgium. Since then he has written numerous works or essays, of which the most important are: a *History of Mediæval Philosophy* (1900), which is perhaps the most valuable book we possess on the subject, and an *Introduction à la Philosophie neo-scholastique*, published in 1904.

In his *Histoire de la Philosophie Médiévale*, Mr. de Wulf departs from the common view which identifies Scholasticism with Mediæval philosophy, and discovers in the Middle Ages two antithetical currents: Scholasticism proper, represented by Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Albert the Great, etc.; and anti-Scholasticism, of which Scotus Erigena is the father, and which is continued by the Catharists, the Albigenses and the Pantheis-

tie schools. Mr. de Wulf's view on this point has not met with a ready acceptance. It has been rejected, among others, by Elie Blane and Picavet. Mr. de Wulf, however, still holds the same opinion, and has defended it again in his *Introduction à la Philosophie Néo-Scholastique*.

The aim of this last work is to remove current misconceptions about the nature of Scholastic philosophy; to give, as in a nutshell, the essential traits of Thomism, and to show to what extent neo-Scholasticism agrees with the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages, and to what extent the old philosophy has been modified. In no other work is the program of neo-Scholasticism so definitely outlined. The study of Mr. de Wulf's *Introduction* is indispensable to those who want to enter the field of neo-Scholastic literature.

With the collaboration of Mr. A. Pelzer, Mr. de Wulf has lately undertaken the publication of unedited works of Mediaeval Belgian philosophers. Among the volumes already published let us mention: *Le Traité De Unitate Formæ de Gilles de Lessines* (1901), *Les Quatres Premiers Quolibets de Godefroid de Fontaines* (1904).

Mr. D. Nys is the cosmologist of the Institute. Besides two volumes dealing with St. Thomas's conception of time and space, and many articles published in the *Revue Néo-Scholastique*, he has contributed to the *Cours de Philosophie* of the Institute the volume on Cosmology.

In no other work—safe perhaps in Farges's essays—are the Scholastic theories about the world so satisfactorily expounded. Nys's Cosmology is even more scientific than Farges's works on the subject. All modern discoveries, all recent scientific results are discussed in connection with the Scholastic system. We may fail to agree with Mr. Nys's conclusions—and I confess that this is my case—but we cannot entertain for a single instant the idea that his conclusions are not the result of a serious study of the matter.

Among the men who have honored the Institute of Louvain by their philosophical productions we must also mention:

L. Noel, who has written valuable works on the question of determinism and free will.

Simon Deploige, professor of economics and political science, who has published a treatise on the Thomistic theory of property and a most interesting essay entitled, *St. Thomas et la question juive*; and E. Crahay, author of a work dealing with St. Thomas's political doctrines.

Finally, the Institute of Louvain deserves the gratitude of all lovers of philosophy by the publication of one of the most interesting and learned reviews actually existing, the *Revue Néo-Scholastique*, whose pages are of immense service, not only to those interested in neo-Scholasticism, but to all students of philosophy.

CHAPTER XIV

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

SECTION 1.—THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN HUNGARY, BOHEMIA AND THE NETHERLANDS

The countries we have studied thus far are those in which neo-Scholastic philosophy has especially flourished. The Catholics of the rest of Europe have not failed, however, to espouse the views of Leo XIII, so that the Thomistic literature of the present century is proud of many productions with which the foregoing chapters have not dealt.

Among the countries in which Thomism has found able representatives, Hungary holds a prominent place. As early as the sixteenth century, Scholastic philosophy flourished in the seminaries erected, according to the spirit of the Council of Trent, by Nicholas Oláh and Cardinal Peter Pazmány, S.J., archbishop of Esztergom. The control thus exercised by Scholastic principles upon Hungarian thought became stronger still through the liberation of Hungary from the Turkish rule. And it thus happened that, in the eighteenth century, while Scholastic philosophy was rapidly losing ground in the rest of Europe, it was regarded in Hungary as a necessary complement of a liberal education.

In the nineteenth century, however, the influence of the French revolution and of German rationalism produced a notable change in the attitude of Hungarian thinkers. As was to be expected, this change was unfavorable to the traditional Christian philosophy. Scholasticism soon lost its former prestige and was finally rejected from the gymnasia, even from the seminaries.

Such was the state of things when the encyclical *Aeterni*

Patris, like an electric spark, produced a sudden change in the attitude of Hungarian Catholics. Scholastic philosophy became an essential element of ecclesiastical studies. In this remarkable movement the Central Seminary of Budapest and the Seminary of Esztergom took the lead. They were soon followed by others, so that nowadays very few ecclesiastical institutions are still lacking a chair of philosophy.

Not long afterwards a Society of St. Thomas was founded in Budapest (1893) and an important periodical publication, the *Bölcseleti Folyóirat*, was created by John Kiss, professor of philosophy in the Seminary of Temesvar (1886). Since its foundation, the *Bölcseleti Folyóirat* has served the cause of neo-Thomism with zeal and success. Among its most distinguished contributors, let us mention J. Kozáry, St. Székely, O. Prohászka, L. Szilvek and J. Ochaba (cf. Bibliography).

Hungarian Catholics have not limited themselves to the articles and discussions contained in the *Bölcseleti Folyóirat*. They have also enriched neo-Scholastic literature with many separate works which, unhappily—on account of the very language in which they are written—are not known outside of Hungary as well as they deserve. Most important among them is the work entitled *Instinct and Intellect* (1898), written by St. Székely, which is probably one of the most important studies ever made about animal instinct; and the two remarkable volumes of Bishop Ottokarus Prohászka. The first of these, *God and the World* (1891), deals with the arguments for the existence of a Supreme Being, whereas the second, *Heaven and Earth* (1901), is a cosmogony.

Among the defenders of neo-Scholasticism in Hungary, the best known is Gustave Pécsi, professor in the Seminary of Esztergom. This is due, in the first place, to the originality of some of his theories, and also to the fact that his most important works have been written in Latin.

Gustave Pécsi, born in 1874, studied in Rome from 1893 to 1900, and received the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and

Theology. Since 1902 he has taught philosophy in the Seminary of Esztergom.

His chief work is entitled *Cursus Brevis Philosophiæ*, and consists of three volumes. The first, dealing with logic and metaphysics, appeared in 1906; the second, dealing with cosmology and psychology, appeared in 1907; the third, dealing with natural theology and ethics, has not appeared yet.

The importance of Mr. Pécsi's philosophy is chiefly due to his section on Cosmology, which marks a most significant phase in the evolution of neo-Scholasticism. Two doctrines of his deserve a special mention: his theory of Matter and Form and his chapter on Energetics.

To many sympathizers of neo-Scholasticism the endeavor to revive the theory of Matter of Form had appeared a fruitless attempt. In view of the actual condition of physical science, the defenders of hylemorphism left the impression of men who would cover a dead body with a new garb. For Aristotle, primordial matter was an indeterminate abstraction, something which was, and yet was not, "*materia neque quid, neque quantum, neque quale, neque aliud quidquam est.*"¹ This mysterious entity had been accepted by the great doctors of the thirteenth century, and still lingered in all treatises of Scholastic philosophy. Those men themselves who were defending Scholasticism from a scientific point of view had not dared part with the fetich. Mr. Albert Farges had clung with all his might to the old idol. Mr. Nys had proved himself to be less reluctant to concessions; he had not yet, however, been bold enough. First among neo-Scholastics, Mr. Pécsi has formulated the theory of Primordial Matter in a form which men of science may accept.

He identifies Primordial Matter with the ultimate ground of all material reality, the ether.² The *materia prima* thus ceases to be an empty abstraction: it becomes something concrete, a

¹ Metaph., Bk. VI, c. 3.

² Cf. Pécsi, *Cursus Brevis Philosophiæ*, Vol. 2, pp. 34 ff.

reality whose existence is testified by natural science itself.³ As for the substantial form, Mr. Pécsi identifies it with the inter-atomic energy.⁴

In the section of his Cosmology entitled "*Energetics*," Mr. Pécsi calls in question the accepted axioms of physical science. He refutes the principle of the conservation of energy, which he regards as the foundation of materialism. He also refutes or corrects the law of entropy and the laws of Newton on inertia and action and reaction. To the traditional laws of motion he opposes the following laws:

1. All physical bodies persevere in the state of rest unless impelled by an external force. But the body impelled by an external force moves only proportionally to the impression received from the external force and always in the direction of the impression.

2. The intensity—or velocity—of the motion depends upon the difference between the action and the reaction, *i. e.*, is in direct mathematical proportion to the action, and in inverse mathematical proportion to the reaction.

3. If the mutual relation of the action and the reaction in subsequent moments is constant, motion will be uniform; if the mutual relation of the action and the reaction is modified, the motion will cease to be uniform and acceleration or retardation will follow.⁵

Mr. Pécsi's theory on this point has not been unanimously accepted by neo-Scholastics. It has been severely criticized by Chr. Schreiber in the *Philosophisches Jahrbuch*. Mr. Pécsi,

³ It is easy to notice the resemblance of Mr. Pécsi's view with the view we have defended in our section on Cosmology. This section, however, has not been influenced in the slightest degree by Mr. Pécsi's theory. It was written in 1906, as a dissertation for the degree of M.A., under the title of "The Scholastic Doctrine of Matter and Form in the Face of Modern Scientific Discoveries," and has not been modified since the publication of Mr. Pécsi's work.

⁴ Cf. Pécsi, *Cursus Brevis Philosophiæ*, pp. 29, 39 ff.

⁵ Cf. Pécsi, *Crisis axiomatum modernæ Phisicæ*, pp. 51 ff.; also *Cursus Brevis*, Vol. 2, pp. 89-90.

however, has developed it anew in a separate treatise, written at first in Hungarian and translated into Latin by the author himself, under the title of *Crisis axiomatum modernæ Physicæ*.

In Bohemia the Thomistic movement is represented by Vycho-dil, who, in 1889, published a work dealing with the proofs of God's existence; Eugene Kaderavek, the author of several works inspired by the purest Scholastic principles and of important articles published in the *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* and the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und speculative Theologie*; Havaty, Pospisil, etc.

In the Netherlands, a chair of Thomistic philosophy was founded in 1894 at the University of Amsterdam and confided to the Dominican Van de Groot. A better choice could hardly have been made. Fr. Van de Groot is one of the most learned and enthusiastic admirers of the philosophy of the Angelic Doctor. In many remarkable works, written in Dutch or in Latin, as well as in articles published in the *Divus Thomas* and the *Revue Thomiste*, he has proved himself to be one of the most worthy champions of the Scholastic cause.

Let us mention also the Jesuit Vogels, who published in Amsterdam, in 1900, a treatise on Free Will, the first contribution to neo-Scholastic literature written in the Flemish language.

SECTION 2.—THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN ENGLAND

In the general return of the Catholic philosophical world to the principles of St. Thomas, England has not remained a laggard. A few years after the promulgation of the encyclical *Æterni Patris*, Thomas Harper, S.J., published his *Metaphysics of the Schools*, still considered as one of the most important works inspired by Scholastic principles during the nineteenth century.

Born in London in 1821, Thomas Harper abjured Methodism and entered the Society of Jesus in 1852. For several years he taught philosophy at the famous college of Stonyhurst. He died in 1893.

His *Metaphysics of the Schools* is an endeavor to present the metaphysical principles of the schoolmen in a form accessible to English readers. By the thoroughness of the exposition and its depth of thought the *Metaphysics of the Schools* must be reckoned as one of the most valuable neo-Scholastic productions. "In England, wrote Domet de Vorges in 1888, we find only one neo-Scholastic writer worthy of mention. But what an author! What a monument! Like a pyramid bathed in the dew of fifty centuries, it rears its massive form aloft in the midst of a desert. The *Metaphysics* of Fr. Harper is certainly the greatest work thus far produced by the Thomistic movement. It is also perhaps the most profound, a work that shows the eminent dialectical faculties of its author in all their brilliancy."⁶

More recently, the English Jesuits have acquired a new title to the gratitude of all lovers of Scholastic speculation by the publication of the *Stonyhurst Philosophical Series*, which is the most valuable exposition of Scholastic philosophy written in the English language.

The series, of which several editions have been made in a few years, comprises the following works: *Logic*, by Richard F. Clarke, S.J.; *First Principles of Knowledge*, by John Rickaby, S.J.; *Moral Philosophy*, by Joseph Rickaby, S.J.; *Natural Theology*, by Bernard Boedder, S.J.; *Psychology*, by Michael Maher, S.J.; *General Metaphysics*, by John Rickaby, S.J.; *Political Economy*, by C. S. Devas.

Particularly worthy of attention are Maher's *Psychology* and Boedder's *Natural Theology*.

Fr. Maher's *Psychology* exposes, in a clear and attractive style, the Scholastic theory of the soul. The essential difference between sense and intellect, the spirituality of the soul, the freedom of the will, are demonstrated according to the best Scholastic arguments. The work also contains a lucid exposition and valuable criticisms of the philosophical systems of Kant, Locke, Hume, Mill, Bain, Spencer and other British asso-

⁶ Cf. Domet de Vorges, in *Ann. de Philos. Chrét.*, vol. xviii, pp. 595-596.

eciationists. It studies the recent hypotheses about the relations of body and soul and pronounces the double-aspect theory contradictory to experience and to reason.

Boedder's *Natural Theology*, in addition to the chapters dealing with the existence and the attributes of God, in which the Scholastic doctrine of the Divine Being is clearly and faithfully expounded, contains a dissertation about the much-disputed question of physical premotion. After a fair exposition of both views, Fr. Boedder declares himself in favor of Molinism and gives serious reasons to show that the so-called Thomistic theory does not really belong to St. Thomas.

A few years after the publication of his *Natural Theology*, Fr. Boedder enriched neo-Scholastic literature with two Latin treatises dealing, the one with *Natural Theology*, the other with *Psychology*. These treatises form two volumes of a new course of Scholastic philosophy, published in Friburg by the Stonyhurst professors, and known as *Cursus Philosophicus* (cf. Bibliography).

Joseph Riekaby (born 1845), besides the volume on Moral Philosophy of the Stonyhurst Series, has contributed several important publications to English neo-Scholastic literature. In 1906 he gave an annotated translation of the *Summa contra Gentiles*. In the same year he published the work, *Free Will and Four English Philosophers (Hobbes, Locke, Hume and Mill)*, in which he defends the freedom of the will against the determinist theories of these philosophers. His method is to quote a passage from the philosopher under examination and then to discuss it.

Richard F. Clarke, the author of the treatise on Logic, has contributed several important articles to the *American Catholic Quarterly*. He has also published a dialogue on the existence of God, which is one of the most charming philosophical dialogues ever penned.

Among the actual defenders of neo-Scholasticism in England, the most prolific is probably Francis Aveling (born 1875). In

quite a number of review articles and short treatises he has proved himself a valiant champion of the Thomistic cause. One of his best productions is the volume entitled, *The God of Philosophy*. In this charming treatise the learned writer educes the natural proofs for the existence of God. His style is simple, clear and concise. The philosophical arguments are shorn of their rigidity and presented in a most fascinating aspect.

CHAPTER XV

THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

SECTION 1.—THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN THE UNITED STATES

Stanley Hall's half-serious, half-jocose words, that "philosophers are as scarce in America as snakes in Norway," could not, without injustice, be repeated to-day. During these last years the European philosophical publications have so frequently studied the works and opinions of our writers that we may, without too much presumption, entertain the belief that philosophy has at last established a permanent settlement among us.

In this phase of our intellectual growth, our Catholic writers have naturally turned their attention to the official philosophy of the Church, so that neo-Thomism, although it has produced in our country no work which may compare with the great European contributions, has nevertheless given rise to excellent treatises which no student of the recent Thomistic movement should neglect.

In the middle of the last century the greatest Catholic writer in America was Orestes A. Brownson (1803-1876). His philosophy, which may be described as a form of ontologism, exercised a great influence upon American Catholics. Gioberti became the man in whose works the only true philosophy was supposed to be found.

Among the writers who were thus controlled by ontologistic principles, one of the best known is Henry A. Brann (born in 1839). In his "*Curious Questions*," published in 1866, he does not hesitate to call Gioberti the greatest philosopher of the nine-

teenth century.¹ According to Mr. Brann, God is an object of direct intuition: "From the mere fact of intuition," says he, "we prove the existence of God. We intue God existing, and therefore we say He exists. This argument is the strongest on account of its clearness."²

In some of his works, however, Mr. Brann is in perfect agreement with the principles of the Scholastics, and even follows their line of reasoning. The small work, *The Spirituality and Immortality of the Human Soul*, were it not for its preface, might well be regarded as a production of the most orthodox neo-Thomist.

To the Jesuits belongs the honor not only of having been the first defenders of Thomism in the United States, but of having furnished the larger and more valuable part of our neo-Scholastic literature.

The first works written in defense of Scholastic principles in this country were due to Louis Jouin, S.J. (1818-1899), professor of philosophy in St. John's College, now Fordham University. Father Jouin's works comprise two volumes in Latin: *Elementa Philosophiæ Moralis* (1865), and *Compendium Logicæ et Metaphysicæ* (1869), and a shorter manual in English: *Logic and Metaphysics*. They have been honored by numerous editions and are still used as text-books in several institutions.

Not long afterwards, another series of text-books on Scholastic philosophy was written by Walter H. Hill (1822-1907). His "*Elements of Philosophy*," of which numerous editions have been made, was published in 1873, for the use of the students of St. Louis University, in which he was professor of philosophy. The *Elements of Philosophy* was soon followed by the volume, *Ethics, or Moral Philosophy* (1878). Besides these two works, Father Hill has written, in defence of the Scholastic principles, numerous articles in the *American Catholic Quarterly* (cf. Bibliography).

¹ Brann, *Curious Questions*, Newark, 1866, p. 107.

² *Ibid.*, p. 159.

The year 1873 was also the date of the publication of Schiffrini's *Logica generalis Institutiones*. An Italian by birth, professor in the house of studies of the Jesuits in Woodstock (Maryland), Biagio A. Schiffrini embodied in his work the lessons he had given to the scholastics. He subsequently published some of St. Thomas's treatises: the *De Homine*, in 1882, and the *De Motu Hominis in Deum*, in 1883.

Among the courses of Scholastic philosophy written by the Jesuits in the United States, the most valuable are probably the two volumes of Nicholas Russo (born April 24, 1845; died April 1, 1902). His *Summa Philosophica* (Boston, 1885), in which he generally follows Liberatore, more complete than Jouin's works, is generally regarded as the most satisfactory exposition of Scholastic philosophy published in this country. In his *De Philosophia Morali* (1890), Fr. Russo published the lectures he had delivered to the students, when professor of moral philosophy in Georgetown University.

Among the courses of Scholastic philosophy thus written with special regard to the needs of the students, we must also mention the works of Charles Coppens and William Poland.

William Poland, born in Cincinnati in 1848, and professor of philosophy in St. Louis University, is the author of several treatises in which the fundamental principles of Scholasticism are expounded and defended in the clearest and most attractive style. His "*Truth of Thought*" (1896) is an excellent textbook on criteriology. Like all Scholastics, Father Poland holds a middle position between the idealist and the materialist. He skilfully points out the inconsistency of subjectivism,³ and proves the objective character of reality by means of the evidence whereby it is presented to us as objective:

"Just as in the perception or knowing of self, I affirm self, so also, for the same reason, evidence, I affirm, with inevitable conviction, the objective value of non-self. I have a thought or a headache. The thought or the headache presents itself to me

³ Cf. *Truth of Thought*, pp. 197, 61.

as mine. I thereupon have a conviction that it is mine. Of this conviction, certified in the perception of what is evident, I cannot rid myself, and I hold to it. The midnight glory of the stars presents itself to me as a something which excludes the element of myself. I have, thereupon, a conviction of that something, as strong as the conviction of my own thought; and simultaneously I have a conviction that that something is distinct from me. Of this conviction, certified in the perception of what is evident, I cannot rid myself; and I hold to it."⁴

The doctrine contained in this quotation is not, however, perfectly clear. We believe a thought to be subjective and the starred sky objective, because the former depends upon our will, while the latter does not; because we can have or reject a thought at pleasure, whereas, if our eyes are open, we are compelled to see the sky. But, why should a headache be any less objective than the starred sky? Does it depend upon a fiat of our will? Can it be rejected as readily as we please? It is an affection of our body, it will perhaps be replied, and our body belongs to our own self. But our vision of the starred sky is a sensation of color which belongs to our body just as well. Why, then, should the sky be objective and the headache subjective? This is a question which Fr. Poland does not face.

Charles Coppens expounded the fundamental principles of Scholastic philosophy in two small volumes: *A Brief Text-book of Logic and Mental Philosophy* (1892), and *A Brief Text-book of Moral Philosophy* (1896). He also published, in 1897, a remarkable work upon which his fame chiefly rests: *Moral Principles and Medical Practice*. In the light of the Christian principles about the human soul, Fr. Coppens closely examines some subjects, such as craniotomy and abortion, which are of burning interest in the field of medicine. He also studies the questions of insanity and hypnotism, and lays down, in the most able manner, the professional rights and duties of the physician.

The American Jesuits have not thus limited themselves to the writing of Scholastic text-books. Such works, however ser-

⁴ Poland, *Truth of Thought*, p. 54.

viceable they may be, exist now in so great a number that new ones cannot but repeat what others have already said. Fr. Coppen's work is one of those studies on particular questions to which neo-Scholastics should now direct their attention. Another study in the same direction has been made by Rene I. Holaind in his *Natural Law and Legal Practice* (1899), which contains the lectures he delivered at the Law School of Georgetown University. Fr. Holaind carefully studies the capital questions of taxation, capital and labor organizations, strikes and boycotts, etc. The solutions he gives are inspired by the principles of Christian philosophy, and perfectly adapted to the actual conditions of society. Not only all students of law, but all American citizens should read and meditate this work.

John J. Ming, professor of Moral Philosophy in Canisius College (Buffalo), besides numerous articles in the *American Catholic Quarterly*, has contributed to American neo-Scholastic ethics a precious work, entitled *The Data of Modern Ethics Examined*.

The aim of the author, as set forth in his preface, is to defend Christian ethics against the recent moral systems advanced by the modern schools of Positivists and Agnostics.

The several forms assumed by hedonism are faithfully exposed and examined at great length. The author is fully conversant with the theories of Spencer, J. S. Mill, and other English empiricists. His criticisms are often excellent, always interesting, and display a remarkable power of analysis.

The hedonistic system of ethics is not, however, as Fr. Ming seems to imply, essentially connected with positivism and agnosticism. The strongest believer in the spirituality of the soul might be as frankly and as consistently a hedonist as Mill or Spencer. A refutation of materialism or agnosticism will not therefore be, at the same time, a refutation of hedonism. This is a truth which Fr. Ming seems to have overlooked. As his work is a treatise on ethics, it ought to attack frankly hedonism

itself, and to lay less emphasis upon the philosophical systems with which hedonism is but accidentally connected.

It is true that the characteristic fallacy of hedonism—its confusing the result of a moral act with the nature of the act—has been perfectly grasped by Fr. Ming:

“Delight is necessary to happiness,” says he. “Every perfect action is followed by delight; for it lies in the nature of a faculty that, having discharged the function for which it was made, perfectly and normally, it comes to rest and is satisfied. But for the very reason that delight is not the action itself, but merely its result or concomitant, it cannot be an essential constituent of happiness: it is but one of its necessary attributes that adheres to it as beauty does to youth.”⁵

This capital flaw of hedonism might have been, however, more strongly insisted upon.

On the whole, Fr. Ming’s work is one of the best productions of neo-Scholastic literature in the field of ethics, and deserves the careful study of all interested in moral philosophy.

In the field of Natural Theology, an important contribution has been made by Maurice Ronayne (1828–1903). His work, *God knowable and known*, published in 1888, has been deservedly honored by several editions. Departing from the usual form in which philosophical treatises are cast, Fr. Ronayne has made use of the dialogue with the greatest skill. The interlocutors meet, now in Fifth Avenue Hotel, now in Central Park amid the scenes of nature, and discuss, in the most attractive language, all questions connected with natural theology.

Other fields of philosophy are incidentally touched upon. The second chapter of the work, entitled: *The Data of Natural Knowledge*, contains a fair exposition of the Scholastic theory of knowledge, as well as an able refutation of idealism.

Fr. Ronayne also studies the Scholastic doctrines of causation and substance. He unmistakably regards substance as an unknown something lying behind the accidents. Speaking of the

⁵ Ming, *Data of Modern Ethics*, p. 89.

phenomenalists, he says: "They do not take gold for silver, nor silver for copper, because these metals differ in the phenomenon of color, but because of something beneath that color and partially manifested by it."⁶

Mention must also be made of *Æmilius de Augustinis*, for his work, *De Deo Uno secundum naturam* (1884), and James Conway (1849–1905), professor in St. Louis University, and author of a small volume entitled, *The Fundamental Principles of Christian Ethics*, which belongs to the series, *Catholic Summer and Winter School Library*.

Thomism has also found distinguished representatives in other religious orders. A name that readily comes to one's mind at the consideration of Scholasticism outside of the Society of Jesus is that of Brother Azarias, of the Christian Schools.

Brother Azarias, born Patrick Francis Mullany (1847–1893), is one of the most distinguished—the most distinguished perhaps—of our Catholic writers. Although known chiefly as a literary critic, he is the author of several philosophical works well worthy of attention. Whether he is a great philosopher or not, I will not here decide. About his originality as a thinker, no doubt can be entertained. In his *Essays philosophical*, he gives the following principle as the first principle of philosophy: "God actualizes Cosmos by the Word, and completes its end in the Word." Which he unriddles in the following manner:

"In the term God, we have the subject of Theodicy and Natural Theology.

"In the term Cosmos, we have the idea that gives us the ideas of space and time, with all their concomitant ideas of number, extension, mathematics, natural history and physics.

"In the term the Word is contained the type of creation—the basis of history—the ideal of literature and art.

"In the term completes its destiny in the Word, we have the whole supernatural order—a Church, the means of sanctification.

"In the term actualizes, we have the idea of pure and supreme

⁶ Ronayne, *God Knowable and Known*, p. 32.

cause expressed, and the real relations of the Creator to his creation."⁷

Brother Azarias thus regards philosophy as embracing all human knowledge, natural and supernatural. This view unequivocally separates him from the neo-Scholastics, to whose school, it is true, he does not profess to belong:

"To belong exclusively to any school of thought," says he, "is to shut out from one's soul all truth but that which presents itself under a given aspect. It is to be continually asking the question, Can any good come out of Nazareth? And yet good can come out of Nazareth; every Nazareth of thought has its own lesson to teach us if we willingly learn it and put it to profit."⁸

Although Brother Azarias is not, strictly speaking, a Scholastic, he has done good service to the cause of neo-Scholasticism in this country by his learned treatises on Mediaeval philosophy. The essay, *Aristotle and the Christian Church*, contains excellent pages dealing with the spirit of the schoolmen. Albert the Great, St. Thomas and Roger Bacon are chiefly dealt with. The author clearly shows that the Mediaeval writers were not servile followers of Aristotle, but that they thought and wrote in the spirit of real philosophers. How Brother Azarias regards the Scholastic revival is clearly indicated in the following statement:

"Finally, there is the intellectual atmosphere of the day in which thought lives and moves. It cannot exist without breathing this air. If the past is revived, it lives only in proportion as it is brought to bear upon the present."⁹

Brother Chrysostom, born Joseph J. Conlan, in New Haven (Connecticut), in 1863, and actually professor of philosophy in Manhattan College (New York), is more strictly a Scholastic than Brother Azarias. He is the author of two brief courses of

⁷ Brother Azarias, *Essays Philosophical*, pp. 158-159.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

Scholastic philosophy. One of them, the *Elementary Course of Christian Philosophy*, is an adaptation of a French work written by Brother Louis of Poissy, and, in spite of its concise form, is one of the most instructive manuals published in this country. The other course, written in Latin, was published in 1897, under the title, *Elementa Philosophiæ Scholasticæ*. It deals with logic, ontology or general metaphysics, and cosmology, and is chiefly inspired by the works of Zigliara, Liberatore and Farges.

Brother Chrysostom has also defended the cause of Scholastic philosophy in several review articles. The most important of them appeared in the *Philosophical Review* in 1894, and was devoted to the study of the theistic argument of St. Thomas.

In the Dominican order, we find a single work worthy of mention; but this work is one of the best studies written by American neo-Scholastics. *La Philosophie en Amérique depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours* of Father Edward Gregory Laurence Van Becelaere (born 1872), was published in 1904, after having appeared in the form of articles in the *Revue Thomiste*. As a study of the various currents of thought which have dominated our country, Fr. Van Becelaere's work, despite its brevity, is the best work we possess. Some aspects of American thought have been, however, entirely overlooked or too briefly treated. A history of American philosophy ought certainly to contain a chapter on Pragmatism.

Fr. Van Becelaere's volume is completed by an appendix dealing with Catholic philosophy in the United States. This part of the work of the learned Dominican contains interesting details on the neo-Scholastic revival in this country.

Scholastic principles have also found able defenders in our secular clergy.

Gennaro Luigi Vincenzo de Concilio, born at Naples (Italy), in 1835, and for a short time professor of dogmatic theology, logic and metaphysics in Seton Hall College, South Orange, New Jersey, published, besides a text-book on Scholastic philosophy (*Elements of Intellectual Philosophy*, 1878), a theo-

logico-philosophical work, entitled *Catholicity and Pantheism* (1874), in which he regards Pantheism as the necessary result of Protestantism,¹⁰ as the universal error in time and space.¹¹ "Every particular error, says he, has either fallen into Pantheism, or disappeared altogether."¹²

John Gmeiner, born in Baernau (Bavaria), on December 5, 1847, and, for seven years, professor at St. Francis Seminary (Milwaukee), and at St. Thomas Seminary (St. Paul), has published several philosophical works, in which, in harmony with Leo XIII's formula: *vetera novis augere*, he endeavors to harmonize the Scholastic teachings with modern science, and mercilessly discards all tenets which cannot be easily harmonized. In a remarkable little work, entitled *Medieval and Modern Cosmology* (1891), he denounces some theories, usually defended in Catholic text-books, and which, in his opinion, reflect but little credit upon Catholic thinking. Among the doctrines thus stigmatized is the theory of Matter and Form.

John T. Driscoll, born in Albany (New York), after studying in Manhattan College and Troy Theological Seminary, completed his studies in the Catholic University. He has taught philosophy for several years in the Theological Seminary at Brighton (Massachusetts) and has enriched American neo-Scholastic literature with two excellent works: *A Treatise on the Human Soul*, published in 1898, and *God*, which appeared two years later.

The method followed in these two works may be characterized as experimental and comparative. In the *Treatise on the Human Soul*, the author starts from the facts of our consciousness: sensations, sentiments, ideas, memories, judgments, reasonings, etc., which are "as true and real as the circulation of the blood, or the existence of physical or chemical forces."

¹⁰ Cf. *Catholicity and Pantheism*, p. 21.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 20.

From such facts of experience he derives, by a process of reasoning, his system as to the nature of the soul.

In agreement with the Scholastic teaching, he proves the principle of our bodily and mental energies to be one and simple, spiritual and immortal.

Scholastic psychology is studied in connection with all adverse teachings. All ancient and modern systems concerning the principle of life in man are discussed with a remarkable erudition and brought face to face with the Scholastic theories.

The inadequacy of Materialism and Positivism is very ably pointed out. The work also contains valuable chapters on the diverse forms of Pantheism and Monism. Some conclusions of the author do not seem, however, perfectly justifiable. He rejects, for example, Kant's opinion that we know phenomena only, and not the thing-in-itself, on the ground that such an opinion is opposed to the data and methods of physical science:

"Science," says he, "deals with real things. The axioms and rules of mathematical science must be verified in concrete objects in order that the calculations founded upon them may have any validity. The same is true of chemistry and of physics."¹³

This objection would be perfectly valid if Kant failed to recognize in the phenomena an objective element. But this is not the case. The phenomenon is subjective in so far as the outside reality, the object, is clothed with the conditions of our sensibility and of our understanding; but it is also objective, inasmuch as it is caused by the thing-in-itself.

We are, with regard to the thing-in-itself, in the same position as a person with a pair of colored glasses would be with regard to the color of a landscape. Although such a person would never know the color of the landscape as it is in itself, he would nevertheless be able to possess a real science of color, to formulate laws, which would be conditioned by the object and in harmony with its manifestations.

¹³ Driscoll, *The Soul*, p. 40.

The aim of the treatise on God is thus set forth in the preface:

"The considerations adduced are the heritage of Christian Philosophy handed down by the pens of St. Augustine and St. Thomas. The marvelous advance in the sciences furnishes increased data for argument and illustration. The question is considered under all aspects. All sources of knowledge are investigated. History, Language, Psychology, Ethics, the Physical sciences, each comes with its special testimony. The aim is simply to collect the data and show their bearing on the idea of God; to answer the question: What is meant by God, and has the idea of God an objective validity?"¹⁴

Like all modern Scholastics, Mr. Driscoll rejects the ontological argument, in its original shape as well as in the form it has assumed in the hands of the neo-Hegelian school. He also rejects the theory of direct intuition of the Divine Being, advocated by Harris, Wilson, Caird, and other non-Catholic writers of the present day. He regards as valid the arguments from universal consent, from the moral life, from the contingency of living beings, from a first cause, from motion, from the order of the universe. He also accepts the old argument drawn from the nature of truth, first proposed by St. Augustine, and recently revived by Josiah Royce. He clearly points out, however, that, in the hands of Mr. Royce, the argument loses its value and involves a *petitio principii*:

"What is (for Royce) the test of subjective truth? Not conformity with external reality. This he expressly rejects. But conformity with a higher intelligence. Hence he is a disciple of Berkeley. Hence he falls into a *petitio principii*. He sets forth with the data of consciousness to reason God's existence as absolute Truth. Yet he postulates the existence of the All-Knower or All-Enfolder to justify the veracity of the data. This was the mistake of Descartes."¹⁵

Mr. Driscoll, as we have seen, has been a student in the Catholic University. This university, the first stone of which was

¹⁴ Driscoll, *God*, p. 3.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

laid on May 24, 1888, in the presence of Cardinal Gibbons, four archbishops, twenty-one bishops and numerous eminent men, among whom President Cleveland, has contributed to neo-Scholastic literature numerous articles in a periodical publication, the *Catholic University Bulletin*. The most eminent contributors have been Edward A. Pace, Edmund T. Shanahan and William Turner (cf. Bibliography).

Mr. Turner has also published valuable articles about the Middle Ages in other reviews, such as the *American Catholic Quarterly*, the *Philosophical Review* and the *New York Review*. His greatest title to the gratitude of all students of philosophy is, however, his *History of Philosophy*, published in 1903. This work has been greatly praised, and with justice. It exposes with a remarkable erudition the philosophical systems of ancient and modern times. More perfectly than any other similar work, it condenses, in a few pages, the spirit and the doctrines of each philosopher it studies. Mr. Turner devotes a special attention to the study of the Middle Ages. Of the 674 pages, which the work contains, 185 are devoted to Scholastic philosophy.

Mention must be made also of two important works written as dissertations for the Doctor's degree. The first of them is *Religion and Morality*, written in 1899, at the Catholic University, by James J. Fox. The work, inspired by the purest Thomistic ethical principles, strives to base upon history and reason the thesis that religion and morality are necessarily connected. The other work, *The Knowableness of God* (1905), written at Notre Dame University by Matthew Schumacher, is one of the most important contributions of neo-Scholasticism to the field of Natural Theology.

SECTION 2.—THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC REVIVAL IN CANADA

The philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas forms the basis of all philosophical teaching in the Catholic institutions of Canada.

A long time before the promulgation of the encyclical *Æterni Patris*, Thomism was already taught in the College of St. Hyacinth.

cinth. One of the professors of this college, Mgr. Desaulniers, wrote a complete course of Scholastic philosophy, inspired by St. Thomas and Liberatore, which has never been published.

The University of Ottawa, directed by the Oblate Fathers, likewise follows the teachings of the Angelic Doctor. It possesses an Academy of St. Thomas in which a thesis, in harmony with the Scholastic principles, is defended every week.

The most important center of Thomism in Canada is, however, the University Laval, in Quebec. As early as 1879, this university adopted Zigliara's *Summa Philosophica* as a textbook in philosophy. In 1884, the Faculty of Theology decided to study St. Thomas in the *Summa Theologica* itself, which has been, since that time, the manual of theology.

The Thomistic movement in Canada has also given rise to a few interesting works. The first in date is the volume entitled, *Philosophy of the Bible Vindicated* (1876), written by Cornelius O'Brien.

Cornelius O'Brien, born on May 4, 1843, in New Glasgow (Prince Edward Island), educated at St. Dunstan's College (Charlottetown), and at the Propaganda (Rome), ordained priest in 1871, professor in St. Dunstan's College, orator, theologian, novelist, poet, has occupied the archiepiscopal see of Halifax from 1883 till his death, on March 9, 1906.

His "*Philosophy of the Bible*" consists of three parts. In the first part, entitled *Natural Theology*, the author proves the existence of a Supreme Being by the well-known Scholastic arguments from a first cause, from the order of the world, and from the universal consent of mankind. He demonstrates that this Supreme Being, or God, existing by necessity of nature, is infinitely perfect, the creator and ruler of the physical world.

In the second part, entitled *Psychology*, he proves the soul to be simple, spiritual, immortal, endowed with free will, and created immediately by God when it is to be infused into the body.

O'Brien differs from most modern defenders of Thomism with

regard to the origin of our ideas. As he insists more than Scholastics usually do, upon the activity essential to substance,¹⁶ and maintains not only that substance acts, but that whatever acts is a substance,¹⁷ he is led to the assertion that the soul is "a force the very essence of which is that it should think, understand, know, will,"¹⁸ that it must therefore necessarily know its own existence and something about happiness, and possess, by the same fact, two ideas which are, if not innate, at least coeval with the soul.

The third part of the *Philosophy of the Bible* is devoted to the study of certain questions which have an intimate connection with ontology and have not been studied in the two preceding parts: space and time, certitude, religion, revelation, the relation of faith and reason, etc.

O'Brien is an enthusiastic admirer of Mediæval philosophy. He is convinced that many "professors who are now extolled as prodigies of learning would, had their lot been cast in the oft-reviled middle ages, have been considered noisy school-boys."¹⁹

In harmony with the Scholastic principle of the unity of truth, he maintains that there can be but one true system of philosophy, and goes even farther than most of the early neo-Scholastics in his contemptuous disrespect for modern thinking.

"Let it be understood from the outset," says he, "that we deny the title of Philosopher to the founders of schools of error. . . . The man who, as a general rule, blunders in the art he professes to follow, is not called a tradesman, but a botcher; why, then, call meaningless scribblers Philosophers? They are literari fungi."²⁰

And if we wish to know more definitely who those "meaningless scribblers" are, we shall perhaps be astonished to find among them:

¹⁶ *Philosophy of the Bible*, pp. 56, 57, 162.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 81, 83.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. vi.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

“Philosophic quacks, such as Hegel, Kant, Darwin, and *id genus omne*;²¹

“Spinoza, who gave such a proof of mental aberration that a school-boy who would be guilty of similar contradictions, would most surely be doomed to lose his first holiday, and obliged to write five hundred times: *Idem non potest simul esse et non esse*;²²

“The disciples of the transcendental German school, who, lulled into a semi-somniferous state, by lager beer and strong cigars, talk misty things which they call transcendental.”²³

Louis A. Paquet, actual president of the University Laval, published, in 1888, in the review *Canada français*, of Quebec, an important article, entitled: *Rosmini et son système*, in which he refutes the Rosminian doctrines by the principles of Scholastic philosophy.

A few years later, Mgr. Paquet published the first volumes of the work upon which his fame chiefly rests, his *Disputationes theologicæ*, which form a learned commentary on St. Thomas's *Summa Theologica*. The first edition of the work was published in Quebec between the years 1893 and 1903. A second edition is now being made at Rome.

Mention must also be made of Brother Symphorien-Louis, of the Christian Schools, who published in Montreal, in 1905, a text-book on Scholastic metaphysics (*Précis de Métaphysique*).

Among the recent defenders of Thomism in Canada, no one perhaps has served the Scholastic cause with a greater distinction than Alexander MacDonald, actual Vicar General of Antigonish and rector of St. Andrews (Nova Scotia).

Born in S. W. Mabou, Cape Breton, on February 18, 1858. Mr. MacDonald studied at St. Francis Xavier College (Antigonish) and at the Propaganda, in Rome, where he was the disciple of the famous Cardinal Satolli. After being ordained, in 1884, he taught philosophy for nineteen years in St. Francis

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 42.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

Xavier College. During this time he showed himself a valiant champion of the Scholastic principles in numerous articles, which appeared in the *Casket*, of Antigonish, or in other periodical publications (cf. Bibliography). Mr. MacDonald is also the author of several important works in theology, such as *The Sacrifice of the Mass* (New York, 1905), *The Sacraments* (New York, 1906), with which this essay is not directly concerned.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF NEO-SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY

I. PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

- Annales de Philosophie chrétienne.* Paris, since 1830.
Bölseseleti-Folyóirat. Budapest, since 1886.
Divus Thomas. Placentiæ, 1879-1905.
Jahrbuch für Philosophie und speculative Theologie. Paderborn, since 1887.
New York Review. New York, since 1905.
La Pensée Contemporaine. Paris, since 1903.
Philosophisches Jahrbuch. Fulda, since 1888.
Revista Luliana. Barcelona, since 1901.
Revue Néo-Scholastique. Louvain, since 1894.
Revue de Philosophie. Paris, since 1900.
Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques. Kain, since 1907.
Revue Thomiste. Paris, since 1893.
Saint-Thomasblätter. Regensburg, 1888 ff.

2. SEPARATE WORKS

- VAN DER AA, S.J., J. Prælectionum Philosophiæ Scholasticæ brevis conspectus. Lovanii, Fonteyn, 1886, 2 ed., 1888.
 ABELARD. Edition Cousin. Paris, 1836; Paris, 1849-59; Migne, Patrologia latina, vol. 178; Sic et Non, Marburgi, 1851.
 ABROELL, LUDW. Anselm Cant: de mutuo fidei ac nationis consortio. Würzburg, 1864.
 ADAMSON, ROBERT. Roger Bacon. An Address. Manchester, 1876.
 ADEODATUS, AURELIUS. Die Philosophie und Cultur der Neuzeit und die Philosophie des hl. Thomas von Aquino. Koeln, 1887.
 ADLHOCH, O.S.B., BEDA FRANZ. Der Gottesbeweis des hl. Anselm. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1895-97.
 Præfationes ad artis scholasticæ inter occidentales fata. Brune, 1898.
 Zur wissenschaftlichen Erklärung des Atheismus. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1905.
 Roseelin und Sanct Anselm. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1907.
 AHERNE, C. Physical Science versus Matter and Form. *Dublin Rev.*, 1899.
 AHNER. Fredegis von Tours. Leipzig, 1878.
 ALAMANNUS, S.J., COSM. Summa Philosophiæ ex variis libris D. Thomæ Aq. in ordinem cursus philosophici accommodata. Editio juxta 2dam. Parisiensem adornata ab A. Bringmann, S.J.; Paris, Lethiellenx, 1890 ff.
 ALEXANDER, ARCHIBALD. Thomas Aquinas and the Encyclical Letter. *Princeton Rev.*, March, 1880.

- ALVARADO, O.P., FRANCISCO. Cartas del Filósofo Rancio. 2 vol., Madrid, 1851-52.
- ALVAREZ, ENRIQUE. Elementos de Filosofía y Moral. Bogotá, 1884.
- ANGELERI. Rosmini è panteista? Risposta del Sac. Prof. Angeleri all'opuscolo degli Universali del P. M. Liberatore. Verona, 1882.
- Un articolo della Civiltà cattolica contro un opuscolo, Rosmini è panteista? esaminato dall'autore dell'opuscolo medesimo. 1882.
- ANGELICUS, P. A végtelen. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1891.
- ANHÄUPEL, G. Az aktus és a potenciaról. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1896.
- ARBOIS Y TOR. Ensayo de Física y Química transcendental. Barcelona, 1879.
- ARNAIZ, MARCELINO. El Instituto superior de Filosofía (Escuela de Santo Tomás de Aquino) en la Universidad Católica de Lovaina. Madrid, 1901.
- La Neo-Escolástica al comenzar el siglo XX. *Ciudad de Dios*, 1902.
- Los fenómenos psicológicos. Cuestiones de psicología contemporánea. Madrid, Tip. del Sagrado Corazón, 1903.
- Elementos de psicología fundada en la experiencia. I.: La vida sensible. Madrid, Tabares, 1904.
- Abuso de las metáforas en las ciencias psicológicas. *Ciudad de Dios*, 1905.
- Mons. D. Mercier, Primado de Bélgica. Su obra filosófica. *Ciudad de Dios*, 1906.
- Pragmatismo y Humanismo. *Cultura española*, 1907.
- ASIN Y PALACIOS, MIGUEL. Algazel. Dogmática, Moral, Ascética. Con prólogo de Menéndez Pelayo. Zaragoza, Comas, 1901.
- El Averroísmo teológico de Santo Tomás de Aquino. Zaragoza, 1904.
- Sens du mot "Tehafot" dans les œuvres d'El-Ghazali et d'Averroes. Traduit par J. Robert, Alger, Jourdan, 1906.
- La Psicología según Mohidin Abenarabi. Paris, Leroux, 1906.
- La indiferencia religiosa en la España musulmana según Aben-hazam, historiador de las religiones y las sectas. Madrid, Imp. Iberica, 1907.
- Description d'un manuscrit arabe-chrétien (Extrait de la Revue de l'Orient chrétien, 1906). Paris, 1907.
- D'ASSAILLY, OCTAVE. Albert le Grand. Paris, 1870.
- ASTROMOFF, J. Introductio ad intelligendam doctrinam Angelici Doctoris. Roma, 1884.
- AUBRY, J. B. Mélanges de philosophie catholique, le cartésianisme, le rationalisme et la scolastique. Paris, Retaux, 1895.
- DE AUGUSTINIS, S.J., AEMILIUS. De Deo Uno secundum Naturam. Praelectiones Scholastico-Dogmaticae quas in Collegio SS. Cordis ad Woodstock habebat; Neo-Eboraci, Benziger, 1884.

- AVELING, FRANCIS. Christian Philosophy. *Dublin Rev.*, 1902.
 The Agnosticism of Faith. *Dublin Rev.*, 1903.
 The Philosophy of Herbert Spencer. *Dublin Rev.*, 1904.
 The Language of the Schools. *Dublin Rev.*, 1904.
 Philosophy, Queen and Handmaiden. *Dublin Rev.*, 1905.
 The Immortality of the Soul. London and Edinburgh, Sands, 1905.
 Science and Faith. London and Edinburgh, Sands, 1906.
 The God of Philosophy. London and Edinburgh, Sands, 1906.
 The Progress of Thought and the Catholic Faith. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1907.
 The Thought-Value of Proof: an Eirenicon. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1907.
- AZARIAS, BROTHER. The Development of Old English Thought. 3 ed., New York, Appleton, 1890.
 Aristotle and the Christian Church. London, Kegan, Paul & Co., 1889.
 Mediæval University Life. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1893.
 University Colleges: their origin and their method. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1893-4.
 Essays philosophical. Chicago, 1896.
- BACH, JOS. Des Albertus Magnus Verhältniss zu der Erkenntnisslehre der Griechen, Römer, Araber und Juden. Wien, Braumüller, 1881.
 Festrede zum 600jährigen Jubiläum Albert's des Grossen. Augsburg, 1881.
- DE BACKER, S.J., STANISLAUS. Institutiones metaphysicæ specialis. Paris, Delhomme & Brigue, 1899-1905.
- BACON, ROGER. edit. Jebb, Opus majus, London, 1733; ed. Brewer, Opus tertium, Opus minus, Compendium Philosophiæ, London, 1859; ed. Bridges, Opus majus, Oxford, 1897.
- DE BAETS, MAURICE. Les bases de la morale et du droit. Paris, Alcan, 1892; Span. by Gonzalez Carreño, Madrid, 1907.
- BAEUMKER, CLEMENS. Das Problem der Materie in der griechischen Philosophie. Münster, Aschendorff, 1890.
 Avencebolis (Ibn Gebirol) Fons Vitæ. Ex arabico in latinum translatus ab Johanne Hispano et Dominico Gundissalino (Beiträge). Münster, 1892-95.
 Ein Tractat gegen die Amalricianer aus dem Anfang des XIII. Jahrh. Paderborn, 1893.
 Handschriftliches zu den Werken des Alanus. Fulda, 1894.
 Die Impossibilia des Siger von Brabant (Beiträge). Münster, 1898.
 Dominicus Gundissalinus als philosophischer Schriftsteller. Münster, Aschendorff, 1900.
- BAEUMKER, CL. & G. VON HERTLING. Beiträge zur Geschichte der

- Philosophie des Mittelalters. Texte und Untersuchung. Münster, 1891 ff.¹
- BAHRDT, H. A. Aleuin der Lehrer Karls des Grossen. Lauenburg, 1861.
- BAILE, LOUIS. Science et Religion. Qu'est-ce que la science. Paris, 1906.
- Genèse des premiers principes. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1907.
- La question du mixte. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1907.
- BALLERINI, GIUSEPPE. Analisi del socialismo contemporaneo. 4. ed., Siena, s. Bernardino, 1901; Span. by Crusat de Eguilaz, Madrid, Rojas, 1902.
- Il dogma Euearistico. La scienza incredula e la filosofia tomistica. Monza, 1900.
- Il principio di causalita e l'esistenza di Dio di fronte alla scienza moderna. Firenze, lib. Fiorentina, 1904; 2. ed., 1908.
- La conoscenza dell'al di là. La dimostrazione dell'al di là. *Scuol. c.*, 1907.
- BALLOU, H. Philosophy and doctrines of Erigena. *Univ. Quart.*, vii, 90.
- BALMES, JAIME. El Criterio. Madrid, 1842; French by E. Manec, Paris, 1850; Engl., New York, 1875; Engl., by Wm. McDonald, Dublin, 1882.
- Filosoffa fundamental. 4 vol., Barcelona, 1846; 7. ed., 1898; French by E. Manec, 3 vol., Paris, 1852; Engl. by Henry F. Brownson (with Introduction by O. A. Brownson), 2 vol., New York, 18; German, by Lormson, 4 vol., Regensburg, 1855-56.
- Curso de filosofia elemental. Madrid, 1847; 9. ed., Barcelona, 1899.
- Cursus philosophiæ elementaris. 2 vol., Barcinone, Brusi, 1848-50.
- Cartas á un escéptico en materia de religión. México, 1849.
- Selecta colección de escritos del Sr. Dr. D. Jaime Balmes. México, 1850.
- Escritos postumos der Sr. Dr. D. Jaime Balmes. México, 1851.
- BALTHASAR, NICOLAS. Le Problème de Dieu, d'après la Philosophie nouvelle. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1907-8.
- BALTUS, URBAIN. L'idéalisme de saint Augustin et de saint Thomas d'Aquin. *Rev. bénéd.*, 1897.
- Dieu d'après Hugues de St. Victor. *Rev. bénéd.*, 1898.
- Une apologie protestante de saint Thomas d'Aquin. *Rev. bénéd.*, 1898.
- BARACH, CARL SIGMUND & JOHANN WROBEL. Bernardi Silvestris De Mundi Universitate, sive Megacosmos et Microcosmos. Innsbruck, 1876.
- BARRAS, BROTHER. St. Thomas's Latest Critic. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1885.
- The Force of Principles. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1890.

¹The works belonging to this collection are marked: (Beiträge) in our Bibliography.

- BARBERIS, ALBERT. *Esse formale estne rei intrinsecum an non? Placentiæ*, 1887.
- Positivismus ac nova methodus psychologica professoris P. Siciliani. *Animadversiones criticae. Placentiæ*, 1887.
- De signis mathematicis adhibendis in logices traditione. *Div. Thom.*, 1890–91.
- BARDENHEWER. Die pseudo-aristotelische Schrift ueber das reine Gute bekannt unter dem Namen Liber de Causis. Freiburg-i-B., 1882.
- BARDOWICZ, LEO. Die rationale Schriftauslegung des Maimonides und die dabei in Betracht kommenden philosophischen Anschauungen desselben. Wien, 1893.
- BARON. Die Bedeutung der Phantasmen für die Entstehung der Begriffe bei Thomas von Aquin. Münster, 1903.
- BARONE, AG. San Tommaso e la filosofia morale. Nola, 1889.
- DE LA BARRE, S.J. Certitudes scientifiques et certitudes philosophiques. Paris, Bloud, 1897.
- L'ordre de la nature et le miracle. Faits surnaturels et forces naturelles, chimiques, psychiques, physiques. Paris, Bloud, 1899.
- La vie du dogme catholique. Autorité, évolution. Paris, Lethielloux, 1900.
- BARRY, WILLIAM. The New Birth of Christian Philosophy. *Contemp. Rev.*, 1883.
- BATTAGLINI, FRANC. Institutiones philosophicæ secundum s. Thomæ Aq. doctrinam. 3ia. impressio, 3 vol., Bologna, 1890.
- BAUDIN. L'acte et la puissance dans Aristote. Paris, 1900.
- BAUMANN, J. J. Die Staatslehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin, des grossten Theologen und Philosophen der katholischen Kirche. Leipzig, 1873.
- BAUMGARTNER, HEINR. Psychologie oder Seelenlehre. 4. Aufl. Freiburg-i-B., Herder, 1899.
- BAUMGARTNER, MATTHIAS. Die Erkenntnisslehre des Wilhelm von Auvergne (Beiträge). Münster, 1893.
- Die Philosophie des Alanus de Insulis, im Zusammenhange mit den Anschauungen des 12. Jahrhunderts dargestellt (Beiträge). Münster, 1896.
- BAUNARD. Un Siècle de l'Eglise de France, 1800–1900. Paris, 1901.
- VON BAUR, FERD. CHR. Die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung. Tübingen, 1838.
- BAUR, JOSEPH. Die actuell unendliche Zahl in der Philosophie und in der Natur. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1900.
- BAUR, LUDWIG. Dominicus Gundissalinus, De divisione Philosophie (Beiträge). Münster, 1903.
- Substanzbegriff und Aktualitätsphilosophie. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1904.
- DE BEAUPUY, CAMILLE. L'Argument de saint Anselme est "a posteriori". *Rev. de Philos.*, 1908.

- BEAUSSIRE, EMILE. D. J. Balmes. *Rev. Moderne*, 1869.
- BECCARIA, P. Saggio di filosofia italiana e tomista. Torino, 1889.
Saggio di filosofia morale. S. Benigno, Canavese, 1891.
- VAN BECELAERE, O.P., L. A Summary Exposition of St. Thomas Aquinas's Philosophy of Knowledge. *Philos. Rev.*, 1903.
La philosophie en Amérique depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours (with Introduction by Josiah Royce). New York, Eclectic Pub. Co., 1904.
- BECKER, JOS. BLAS. Der Satz des hl. Anselm: Credo, ut intelligam in seiner Bedeutung und Tragweite. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1905-6.
- BEDER. De Anselm. Cant. Lugd. Batav., 1832.
- BEER, PETER. Leben und Wirken des Rabbi Moses ben Maimon. Prag, 1834.
- BEGIN. Sciences naturelles du moyen âge. Paris, 1851.
- BENISCH, A. Two lectures on the life and writings of Maimonides. London, 1847.
- BENYÁCS, J. A keresztény szocializmusról. Budapest, 1905.
- BENZONI, R. La filosofia dell'Accademia Romana di San Tommaso. *Rev. ital. di filos.*, 1886.
- BERGEMANN. Der scholastische Staatsgedanke. *Ph. Wochenschrift u. Literatur-Zeitung*, Bd. 3, 1906.
- BERGON Y VASQUEZ, A. Estudios críticos acerca de las obras de Sto. Tomás de Aquino. Madrid, 1899.
- ST. BERNARD. Opera, Paris, 1839. Lyon, 1845; ed. J. M. Mandernach, tom. 1, Trev., 1861; French by A. Ravelet, Paris, 1865; by Charpentier, 8 vol., Paris, 1873; Swedish by H. Wieselgren, Stockholm, 1844.
- BERNIES, VICTOR. Immatérialité et matérialité de l'âme humaine. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1901.
Spiritualité et immortalité. Paris, Bloud, 1901.
L'Abstraction scolastique et l'"Intellectus agens." *Rev. de Philos.*, 1904.
L'origine des idées. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1906.
- BERTHAUMIER. Histoire de saint Bonaventure. Paris, 1858. German. Regensburg, 1863.
- BERTHIER, O.P., J. J. Tabule systematicæ et synopticæ totius Summæ Theologicæ juxta ipsammet Doctoris Angelici methodum strictius et clarius exactæ. Friburgi Helvetiorum, ed. altera, 1893.
Tabule systematicæ et synopticæ totius Summæ contra Gentiles. Paris, 1900.
L'étude de la Somme Théologique de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Paris, 2. ed., 1906.
- BERTINARIA, F. Il problema capitale della Scolastica. *Riv. ital. di filos.*, 1889.

- BESSE, CLEMENT. Deux centres du mouvement thomiste. Rome et Louvain. Paris, Letouzey & Ané, 1902.
- Philosophie et Philosophes. Essais de critique philosophique. Première série. Préface par l'abbé Guibert. Paris, Lethielleux, 1904.
- Lettre de France. L'agonie de la morale. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1906.
- Lettre de France. Pour l'intellectualisme. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1907.
- BESSMER, S.J., J. Störungen im Seelenleben. Freiburg-i-B., Herder, 1905.
- Scholastik und moderne Philosophie. *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 1907.
- BETHUNE. L'enseignement de la philosophie thomiste à l'université catholique de Louvain. Louvain, 1887.
- BEVILACQUA, VIRGILIO. Confronto delle dottrine dei Rosminiani e dei Neotomisti. Vicenza, 1882.
- BEYSENS, J. TH. De Ontwikkelingsgeschiedenis der organische soorten. van het standpunt der Scholastieke Wijsbegeerte. Leiden, Theonville, 1902.
- Criteriologie of de Leer over waarheid en zekerheid. Leiden, Theonville, 1903.
- Ontologie of Algemeene Metaphysica. Amsterdam, Van Langenhuyzen, 1904.
- Algemeene Zielkunde. Amsterdam, 1906.
- Theodicee of natuurlijke Godsleer. Erste Deel: Gods bestaan, Theorien, Godsbewijzen. Amsterdam, 1907.
- BIANCHI, O.P., RAIMUNDO. De Constitutione monarchica Ecclesiae et de Infallibilitate Romani Pontificis juxta D. Thomam Aquinatis ejusque scholam, Romæ. 1870.
- BIERBOWER, A. St. Thomas Aquinas. *New Englander*, 1883.
- BIGUET. Philosophes modernes et philosophes scolastiques. *Science cath.*, 1906.
- BIHARI, F. Az idealizmus története. Budapest, 1900.
- A lélek mibenléte Aristotelesnél. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1901.
- Az emberi értelem Aristotelesnél. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1903.
- Billia, L. M. Di alcune contradizioni del neotomismo. *Nuovo Risorgimento*, 1897-98.
- L'esigilio di S. Agostino. Torino, 1899.
- BILLROTH, J. G. F. De Anselmi Cantuariensis proslogio et monologio. Lipsia, 1832.
- BINDEL, R. Die Erkenntnisslehre Hugo's von St. Victor. Prog. des Realgymnasiums zu Quackenbrück, 1889.
- BITTCHER, H. Das Leben des Peter Abälard. *Zeitsch. f. histor. Theol.*, 1869.
- Die Schriften, der philosophische Standpunkt, und die Ethik des Peter Abälard. *Zeitsch. f. histor. Theol.*, 1870.

- BLANC, ELIE. *Traité du libre arbitre*. Lyon, 1886.
Traité de philosophie scolastique. Lyon, Vitte, 1889; 2. ed., 1893.
Histoire de la philosophie et particulièrement de la philosophie contemporaine. Lyon and Paris, 1896.
Mélanges philosophiques. Lyon and Paris, 1897-1900.
Opuscules philosophiques. Lyon and Paris.
Manuale philosophiæ scholasticæ. 2 vol., Lyon, Vitte, 1901.
La Vérité. Sa définition et ses espèces. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1901.
Dictionnaire de philosophie ancienne, moderne et contemporaine. Paris, Lethiellieux, 1906.
La foi et la morale chrétienne. Paris, Lethiellieux, 1907.
- BLANC, ELIE, AND HUGUES VAGANAY. *Répertoire bibliographique des auteurs et des ouvrages contemporains de langue française ou latine*. Paris, Vie et Amat, 1902.
- BLANCHE, A. *Sur l'usage de l'évidence comme suprême critérium*. *Rev. thom.*, 1903-4.
- DE BLANCHE-RAFFIN, A. *Balmes, sa vie et ses ouvrages*. Paris, 1843; German by F. X. Karker, Regensburg, 1852.
- BLOCH, MOISE. *Le livre des préceptes par Moïse ben Maimon, publié dans l'original arabe*. Paris, 1888.
- BOEDDER, S.J., BERNARD. *Natural Theology*. New York, Benziger, 1891; London, Longmans, Green & Co., 2d ed, 1899.
Psychologia naturalis sive philosophia de anima humana. Friburgi, 1894; ed. 4., 1906.
Theologia naturalis sive philosophia de Deo. Friburgi, 1895.
- BOLLEA, L. C. *Il misticismo di s. Bonaventura, studiato nelle sue antecedenze e nelle sue esplicazioni*. Torino, Clausen, 1901.
- BONACINA, C. *Dottrina di san Tommaso d'Aquino sul concorso generale di Dio nell'azione creata*. Milano, 1889.
- BONATELLI. *La psicologia di D. Mercier*. *Riv. filos.*, 1900.
- S. BONAVENTURA. *Opera*; ed. A. C. Peltier. 15 vol., Paris and Besançon, 1864-71; edita studio et cura PP. Collegii a S. Bonaventura. Ad Claras Aquas, prope Florentiam, 1882-98.
De humane cognitionis ratione anecdota quardam Seraphici Doctoris S. Bonaventuræ et nonnullorum ipsius discipulorum. Ad Claras Aquas, prope Florentiam, 1883.
Tria opuscula. Breviloquium, Itinerarium mentis in Deum et De reductione artium ad theologiam, edita studio et cura PP. Colleg. a S. Bonaventura. Quaracchi, 1890.
- BONGHI. *L'ultima enciclica e il pensiero del pontefice*. *Nuova Antologia*, liv, 1885.
- BONITO. *Della filosofia dialettica, suo scopo ed importanza coll'aggiunta delle regole a ben condurre le dispute filosofiche e teologiche*. Siena, s. Bernardino.

- BONNIER, E. Abélard et saint Bernard: la philosophie et l'Eglise au douzième siècle. Paris, 1862.
- BONNIFAY. Les preuves traditionnelles de l'existence de Dieu. *Pensée contemp.*, 1906.
- DE BONNIOT, S.J., J. La bête comparée à l'homme. 2. ed., Paris, Retaux, 1889.
- L'âme et la physiologie. Paris, Retaux, 1889.
- BORNEMANN, J. Anselmus et Abælardus sive initia scholasticismi. Haunia, 1840.
- BOSSARD, E. Alanus de Insulis. Antielaudianus cum divina Dantis Aligh. comœdia coll. Angedavi, 1885.
- BOSSU, L. Sommaire de Philosophie. Louvain, Peeters, 1890.
- BOTTALLA. La composition des corps d'après les deux principaux systèmes qui divisent les écoles catholiques. Le Puy, 1877.
- BOUCHITTÉ, H. Le rationalisme chrétien à la fin du XI. siècle. Paris, 1842.
- DE LA BOUILLERIE, F. A. R. L'homme, sa nature, son âme, d'après la doctrine de saint Thomas. Paris, 1890.
- BOULAY, N. Principes d'anthropologie générale. Paris, Lethielleux, 1901.
- BOUQUILLON, THOMAS. The University of Paris. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1895-96.
- BOURGEAT, J. B. Etudes sur Vincent de Beauvais ou Spécimen des études philosophiques, théologiques, scientifiques au moyen âge. Paris, Durand, 1856.
- BOURQUARD. Doctrine de la connaissance, d'après saint Thomas d'Aquin. Angers, 1877.
- L'encyclique "Æterni Patris." Paris, Berche & Tralin, 1884.
- Saint Thomas dans la question de l'Immaculée Conception. *Coutances*, 1891.
- BOVIO, G. Dante e la filosofia medievale. *Riv. di Filos. Scient.*, 1891.
- DE BOYLESVE, S.J., MARIN. Cursus philosophiæ, complectens Logicam, Metaphysicam, Ethicam. Accedit compendiosa religionis demonstrationis et historia philosophiæ. Parisiis, 1855.
- Problèmes contemporains. 5 vol., Paris, 1862.
- Questiones de philosophia. Sancti Clodoaldi, 1863.
- Problèmes de philosophie morale. La fin dernière. *Rev. sc. ecclés.*, 1866.
- Cours de Philosophie. Paris, Lecoffre, 1870.
- Idee et Plan de la Philosophie. Paris et Lyon, 1866; 2. ed., Paris, 1868.
- Précis de Philosophie. Paris, Lecoffre.
- Logique. 3. ed., Paris, Lecoffre, 1870; 4. ed., 1875.
- Principes de la morale. Paris, 1881.

- DE BOYLESVE, S. J. MARIN. Plan d'études et de lecture. 4. ed., Paris, Haton, 1884.
 Saint Thomas, ou l'Ange de l'Ecole. Paris, 1886.
- BRAM, C. Der hl. Bonaventura als Mystiker. *Katholik*, Bd. LVIII, Mainz, 1887.
- BRANN, HENRY A. The Spirituality and Immortality of the Human Soul. A Reply to the Materialists. New York, Cath. Public. Soc. Co., 1885.
- BRAUN, FRIDERICUS. De Petri Abalardi ethica. Marburgi Cattorum, 1852.
- VON BRENTANO, E. Albertus Magnus, Ordensmann, Bischof und Gelehrter. München, 1881.
- BRESCII, J. Essai sur les " Sentences " de Pierre Lombard. Strasbourg, 1857.
- BRESSOLES. Etude sur le traité des lois de saint Thomas d'Aquin. *Rev. de l'Acad. de législation de Toulouse*, 1853.
- BRICEÑO, SECUNDINO. Ligeros apuntes sobre la Filosofía de Spencer comparada con la Filosofía Escolástica. León, 1894.
 Opusculum. De quarta figura syllogistica. Leon, 1904.
 La doctrina del Angélico Doctor sobre la Inmaculada Concepción de la Madre de Dios. Estudio Filosófico-Teológico. León, 1904.
 Respuesta á las Observaciones acerca del Opúsculo " La Doctrina del Angélico Doctor sobre la Inmaculada Concepción de la Madre de Dios," las cuales fueron publicadas por la revista Razón y Fé, en el artículo " Santo Tomás y la Inmaculada Concepción ". León, 1905.
- BRIN, P. M. Methodus analytico-syntheticæ in scientiis metaphysicis. De intellectualismo juxta mentem Syllabi vaticanique concilii adversus errores philosophicos, præcipue rationalismum, positivismum et novam criticem. 3 vol., 1874-76.
 Histoire générale de la philosophie. 3 vol., 1882-86.
- BROCKHOFF, JOS. Die Lehre des hl. Thomas von der Erkennbarkeit Gottes. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1891.
- DE BROGLIE. Le positivisme et la science expérimentale. 2 vol., Paris, Victorion, 1881.
 La Morale sans Dieu, ses principes et ses conséquences. Paris, 1886.
 La réaction contre le positivisme. Paris, Plon, 1894.
 Les conditions modernes de l'accord entre la foi et la raison. Paris, Bloud, 1903.
- BRUNIES, GABRIEL. La foi chrétienne et la philosophie au temps de la renaissance carolingienne. Paris, 1903.
- BUCHWALD. Der Logosbegriff des Johannes Scotus Erigena. Leipzig, 1884.
- BUKOFZER, J. Maimonides im Kampf mit seinem neuesten Biographen. P. Beer. Berlin, 1844.

- BULLIAT, G. *Thesaurus philosophiæ thomisticæ seu selecti textus philosophici ex S. Thomæ Aq. operibus deprompti et secundum ordinem in scholis hodie usurpatum dispositi*. Nannetis, 1899; Paris, Amat, 1900.
- BULLINGER, ANT. *Phantasterei oder Schwindel? Frage an den Neuscholastiker Dr. M. Glossner betreffend seine Kritik der von mir vertretenen Philosophie*. München, 1897.
- Mein letztes Wort an den Neuscholastiker Dr. M. Glossner. München, Ackermann, 1899.
- BULLIOT. *La théorie des catégories dans la philosophie péripatéticienne. Histoire et critique. Congrès scientif. intern. des catholiques*, 1897.
- BULLÓN FERNÁNDEZ, E. *Ensayos de crítica filosófica. El alma de los brutos ante los filósofos españoles*. Madrid, Hernández, 1897.
- Jaime Balmes y sus obras. *Rev. Contemporanea*, 1903.
- BÜLOW, GEORG. *Des Dominicus Gundissalinus Schrift von der Unsterblichkeit der Seele (Beiträge)*. Münster, 1896.
- BUONPENSIERE, O.P., H. *Commentaria in I. P. Summæ Theologiæ S. Thomæ Aquinatis O.P. a qu. I ad qu. xxiii*. Romæ, 1902.
- BURGOGNONI. *Le dottrine filosofiche di S. Bonaventura*. Bologna, 1881.
- BURNS, CECIL DELISLE. *The Catholicizing of Philosophy*. *New York Rev.*, 1907.
- BUROLA, PAOLO. *Trattato della conoscenza intellettuale del P. Liberatore, nella parte che riguarda il Rosmini al Tribunale dell' Autorità*. Lucca, 1857.
- BURONI, GIUSEPPE. *Rosmini e San Tommaso*. Torino, 1878.
- Risposta al Padre Cornoldi di C. di G. in difesa delle nozioni di ontologia secondo Rosmini e San Tommaso. Torino, 1878.
- La Trinità e la Creazione: nuovi confronti tra Rosmini e S. Tommaso. Torino, 1879.
- BURRI, ANT. *Le teorie politiche di San Tommaso e il moderno diritto pubblico*. Parigi, 1884.
- BUSCOMARI, F. A. *S. Bonaventura ordinis fratrum minorum minister generalis*. Romæ, 1874.
- CACHEUX. *De la philosophie de saint Thomas*. Paris, 1858.
- CAGIGAS, RAFAEL. *Canto á la Belleza. Un cristiano y un platónico*. México, 1889.
- Obras de Rafael Cagigas, Phbro.
- Tomo 1. *Pensamientos*.
- Tomo 2. *Estudios sobre el amor según la filosofía griega*.
- Tomo 3. *Ensayo sobre un nuevo sistema ideológico*.
- Tomo 4. *Estudios sobre la Moral*. México, 1890.
- CAIN, JAMES A. *Right and Wrong: Their relation to Man's Ultimate End; Is the Norma of Morality Absolute or Relative?* *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1881.

- CAJETANUS O.P., THOMAS DE VIO. *Commentaria in Summam Theologicam S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Rursus edita cura H. Prosperi. Lyra*, 1891 ff.
- CAMBIER, O. J. *Elementa philosophiæ scholasticæ. 2. ed., Tournai*, 1895.
- CANALEJAS, F. DE P. *Las doctrinas del doctor iluminado Raimundo Lulio, 1270-1315.*
- CANELLA, G. *Del problema degli universali e del nominalismo nella prima fase del loro svolgimento storico. Scuola Cattolica*, 1906-7.
- DA CAPANNORI, BERNARDO. *Sull'insegnamento rosminiano. Lucca*, 1854.
- CAPELLO, F. *Cenni storici e critici sull'origine e natura della filosofia scolastica. Torino*, 1879.
- Principii di filosofia secondo San Tommaso. Rassegna naz.*, 1890.
- CAPPOZZA, F. *Sulla Filosofia dei Padri e Dottori della Chiesa e in ispezialtà di San Tommaso in opposizione alla Filosofia moderna. 1868.*
- CAPPELLAZZI, ANDREA. *Gli elementi del pensiero. Studio di psicologia e ideologia secondo la dottrina di S. Tommaso d'Aquino. Crema. 1888.*
- Le moderne libertà esaminate secondo i principii della filosofia scolastica. Crema, Cazzamali*, 1890.
- L'Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi compendiata. Parte 2. Del sentimento. Crema, Rolleri*, 1891.
- La dottrina di S. Tommaso sulla conoscenza che Dio ha delle cose. Parma*, 1893.
- Il principio etico e il principio giuridico considerati nel concetto scienziiale e nella manifestazione storica. Lodi*, 1894.
- San Tommaso e la schiavitù. Crema*, 1900.
- La persona nella dottrina di San Tommaso d'Aquino e l'odierno movimento intellettuale. Siena, s. Bernardino*, 1900.
- Filosofia sociale. Quale sede occupa la sociologia nella gerarchia scientifica. Siena, s. Bernardino*, 1902.
- La dottrina di San Tommaso nella sociologia moderna. Parte I. Sociologia economica. Bitonto, tip. Vescovile*, 1902.
- Le questioni moderne. Siena, s. Bernardino.*
- Sociologia civile. Siena, s. Bernardino.*
- La superiorità e l'immanenza del Sacerdozio cattolico. Siena, s. Bernardino.*
- Qui est: Studio comparativo tra la 2. questione della Somma Teologica di San Tommaso e le conclusioni di sistemi filosofici. Crema*, 1903.
- CAPPELLI. *Il concetto della vita scientificamente e moralmente considerata. Siena, s. Bernardino.*
- CAPREOLUS. *Defensiones Theologiæ Divi Thomæ. Tours*, 1900-2.
- CARBONEL. *Histoire de la Philosophie. Paris*, 1883.

- CARBONNELLE, S.J., IGNACE. L'Encyclopédie du 4 Août 1879 et la science. Bruxelles, 1879.
 Les confins de la science et de la philosophie. 2. ed., Paris, Palme, 1881.
- CARLE, P. J. Histoire de la vie et des écrits de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Paris, 1846.
- CARLYLE, A. J. Political theories of Thomas Aquinas. *Scottish Rev.*, 1896.
- CARLYLE, R. W. Theories of Thomas Aquinas on Church and State. *Econ. Rev.*, 1896.
- CARO, E. M. La philosophie de saint Thomas d'Aquin. *Rev. Contemp.*, 1858.
- CARO, MIGUEL ANTONIO. Estudio sobre el Utilitarismo. Bogotá, 1869.
- CARPIO, JUAN. Discurso pronunciado por el Señor Vice-Rector y Catedrático del mismo Colegio (Seminario de León), Phro. D. J. Carpio. León, 1869; 2. ed., 1870.
- CARRA DE VAUX. Le syllogisme. *Ann. de Philos. chr.*, 1898.
 Avicenne. Paris, Alcan, 1900.
- CARRASQUILLA, RAFAEL MARÍA. Sobre el estudio de la filosofía. *Repert. Colomb.*, Agto de 1881.
 Ensayo sobre la doctrina liberal. 2. ed., Madrid, 1899.
 Lecturas sobre el arte de educar. *Rev. Col. del Rosario*, 1906.
- CARRASQUILLA, RICARDO. Sofismas anticatólicos vistos con microscopio. Bogotá, lib. Americana, 1881.
- CARRIÈRE, MORITZ. Abälard und Heloise. Giessen, 1844; 2. ed., 1853.
- CARTASEGNA, DOMENICO. Panegirico di San Tommaso d'Aquino. Genova, 1898.
- DE CASAMAJOR, L. Hétérogenie, transformisme et darwinisme. Problème de l'espèce. Bar-le-Duc, 1901.
- CASANOVA, GABRIELIS. Cursus philosophicus ad mentem D. Bonaventuræ et Scoti. Matriti, 1894.
- CASARA, SEB. I Rosminiani e l'ontologismo del P. Cornoldi. Milano, 1878.
- CASTELEIN, S.J., A. Cours de Philosophie. Namur, 1887-89; n. ed., Bruxelles, 1901.
 Psychologie, la science de l'âme dans ses rapports avec l'anatomie, la physiologie et l'hypnotisme. Namur, Delvaux, 1890.
 Le Socialisme et le droit de propriété. Bruxelles, 1896.
 Institutiones philosophiæ moralis et socialis. Bruxelles, 1900.
 Institutiones philosophiæ morales et socialis. Editio minor. Bruxelles, 1900.
- CATHREIN, S.J., VICTOR. Das "jus gentium" im römischen Recht und beim hl. Thomas von Aquin. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1889.
 Moralphilosophie. Eine wissenschaftliche Darlegung der sittlichen, einsch. der rechtlichen Ordnung. Freiburg-i-B., Herder, 1891; 3. ed., 1899.

- CATHELIN, S.J., VICTOR. Der Socialismus. Eine Untersuchung seiner Grundlagen und seiner Durchführbarkeit. Freiburg-i-B., 7. ed., 1898; Span. by E. Vogel, Madrid, 1891; by Sabino Azuarez, S.J., Barcelona, 1907; Engl. by James Conway, New York, 1892; Ital. by G. Cecconi, Torino, 1898.
- Das Privatgrundeigenthum und seine Gegner. Freiburg-i-B., 1892.
- Philosophia moralis in usum scholarum. Freiburg-i-B., Herder, 1893. ed. 3., 1900.
- Worin besteht das Wesen des sittlich Guten und des sittlich Bösen? *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1896.
- Der Begriff des sittlich Guten. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1899.
- Recht, Naturrecht und positives Recht. Eine kritische Untersuchung der Grundbegriffe der Rechtsordnung. Freiburg, Herder, 1901.
- Die Frauenfrage. Freiburg, Herder, 1901.
- Die katholische Moral in ihren Voraussetzungen und ihren Grundlinien. Freiburg, Herder, 1907.
- CAUSETTE. Saint Bernard and his Work. Transl. from the French by A. Burder. London, 1874.
- CAVANAGH, O.P., PIUS. The Life of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor. London, Burns & Oates.
- DE CEBALLOS, FERNANDO. Insanias ó demencias de los filósofos confundidas por la sabiduría de la Cruz. Obra inédita publicada por D. León Carbonero y Sol. Madrid, Perez Dufrull, 1878.
- CEILLIER, H. Le problème spiritualiste; l'existence de l'âme. Paris, Beauchesne, 1893.
- CERUTTI, FRANC. De'principii pedagogico-sociali di San Tommaso. Torino, 1893.
- CHABIN, S.J., P. Les vrais principes du droit naturel, politique et social. Paris, Berche & Tralin, 1901.
- CHARLES, EMILE. Roger Bacon: sa vie, ses ouvrages, ses doctrines, d'après des textes inédits. Paris, 1861.
- CHARMA, A. Saint Anselme. Caen, 1854.
- CHAROUSSET, A. Le Problème métaphysique du Mixte. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1903.
- CHATARD, FRANCIS SILAS. The Brute-Soul. *Cath. World*, 1893.
- CHEVALIER, C. U. J. Saint Thomas d'Aquin: bio-bibliographie. Montebourg, 1883.
- Catalogue critique des œuvres de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Rome, 1887.
- CHIESA, L. La Biomeccanica, il Neovitalismo e il Vitalismo tradizionale. Roma, 1900.
- La base del realismo e la critica neo-kantiana. Roma, 1901.
- CHOCARNE. Saint Thomas d'Aquin et l'encyclique de Léon XIII. Paris, 1884.

- CHOLLET, J. A. De synthesi philosophica D. Thomæ Aquinatis. *Rev. sci eccles.*, 1897.
 De la notion d'ordre, parallélisme des trois ordres de l'être, du vrai, du bien. Paris, Lethielleux, 1899.
 La morale stoïcienne en face de la morale chrétienne. Paris, Lethielleux, 1899.
 La psychologie des élus. Paris, Lethielleux, 1901.
 La psychologie du Purgatoire. Paris, Lethielleux, 1902.
 La psychologie du Christ. Paris, Lethielleux, 1903.
- CHOULANT. Ueber Albert d. Grossen. Hentschel's "Janus," Breslau, 1846.
- CHRÉTIEN, A. Etudes sur le mouvement néo-thomiste. *Rev. int. de théol.*, Berne, 1899.
- CHRISTLIEB, THEODOR. Leben und Lehre des Johannes Scotus Erigena. Gotha, 1860.
- CHRYSOSTOM, BROTHER. Elementary Course of Christian Philosophy. Based on the principles of the best scholastic authors. Adapted from the French of Brother Louis of Poissy by the Brothers of the Christian Schools. New York, O'Shea, 1893.
 The Theistic Argument of St. Thomas. *Philos. Rev.*, 1894.
 Elementa Philosophiæ Scholasticæ. Pars Prior. N. Y. C. Pro-tectory, 1897.
- CHURCH, G. W. Saint Anselm. London, 1870.
- CICCHITTI-SURIANI, FIL. Sopra Raimundo Sabunda, teologo, filosofo e medico del secolo XV. Aquila, 1889.
 Melchior Cano teologo e filosofo del secolo XVI. e la sua opposizione all'Aristotelismo della scolastica. Aquila, tip. Aternina, 1891.
- CICOGNANI, F. M. Sulla vita e sulle opere di San Tommaso d'Aquino. Venezia, 1874.
- DA CIVITTA, MARCELLINO. Delle dottrine filosofiche del S. D. S. Bonaventura. Genova, 1874.
- CLARKE, S.J., RICHARD F. The Existence of God. A Dialogue. New York, Benziger, 1887.
 A Skeptical Difficulty against Creation. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1887.
 The Central Error of Modern Philosophy. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1888.
 Induction, Ancient and Modern. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1888.
 Logic. New York, Benziger, 1889; London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1901.
 On the Obscurity of Faith. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1893.
- CLEMENS, F. J. De Scholasticorum sententia Philosophiam esse Theologiam aneam. Commentatio. Monasterii Guestphalorum, 1857.
- CLERVAL, A. Les écoles de Chartres au moyen âge, du V. au XVI. siècle. Paris, 1895.

- COCOSNIER, O.P., THOM. *L'âme humaine, son existence et sa nature.* Paris, 1890.
 Le vrai thomiste. *Rev. Thom.*, 1893.
- COFFEY, P. *A New Book on Scholastic Philosophy.* *Irish Eccles. Rec.*, 1907.
- COLVENERIUS. *Die Anfänge wissenschaftlicher Naturgeschichte und naturhistorischer Abbildung im christlichen Abendlande.* Leipzig, 1856.
- COMBES, J. L. EMILE. *La Psychologie de saint Thomas d'Aquin.* 1860.
- COMELLAS Y CUET, ANTONIO. *Demonstración de la armonía entre la religión católica y la ciencia.* Barcelona, 1880.
 Introducción á la filosofía, ó sea doctrina sobre la dirección al ideal de la ciencia. Barcelona, 1883.
- COMMER, ERNST. *Die philosophische Wissenschaft.* Berlin, 1882.
System der Philosophie. Paderborn, 1883-86.
Logik (als Lehrbuch dargestellt). Paderborn, 1897.
Die immerwährende Philosophie. Wien, 1899.
- COMPAGNION, J. *Critique thomiste du thomisme.* Pas-de-Calais, 1907.
- DE CONCILIO, J. *Catholicity and Pantheism. All Truth or no Truth.* New York, Sadlier, 1874; n. ed., 1881.
The Elements of Intellectual Philosophy. New York, Sadlier, 1878.
The Doctrine of St. Thomas on the Right of Property and its Use. New York, Pustet, 1887.
Scientific and Metaphysical Cosmology. *Amer. Eccles. Rev.*, 1892.
- CONTESTIN, G. *Le matérialisme et la nature de l'homme.* Paris, Bloud, 1900.
La Providence. Conservation des êtres créés. Gouvernement du monde. Répartition des biens et des maux. Paris, Bloud, 1901.
- CONTI, AUGUSTO. *Evidenza, Amore e Fede, o i criterii della filosofia.* Firenze, 1858.
Storia della Filosofia. Firenze, 1864; 3. ed., 1882; French by Leon Collas, 1881.
La filosofia di Dante. Firenze, 1865.
Il Vero nell'Ordine. Firenze, 1876.
- CONTZEN. *Zur Würdigung des Mittelalters mit besonderer Beziehung auf die Staatslehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin.* Cassel, 1870.
- CONWAY, S.J., JAMES. *The True Idea of the Beautiful.* *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1885.
The Fundamental Principles of Christian Ethics. Chicago, McBride, 1896.
- COPPENS, S.J., CHARLES. *A Brief Text-book of Logic and Mental Philosophy.* New York, Cath. Pub. Soc., 1892.
A Brief Text-book of Moral Philosophy. New York, Cath. Bk Co., 1896.
Moral Principles and Medical Practice. New York, Benziger, 1897.

- CORCORAN, JAMES A. The Immortality of the Soul. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1877.
- The Recent Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1879.
- DE CÓRDOBA, B. Noticia histórico-literaria del Doctor D. J. Balmes, Pbro. México, 1850.
- CORNELLI, ART. Compendium philosophiæ generalis seu fundamentalis. ed. 2., Turino, 1896.
- CORNOLDI, S. J., GIOVANNI MARIA. I sistemi meccanico e dinamico circa la costituzione della sostanza corporea rispetto alle scienze fisiche. Verona, 1864.
- Thesaurus philosophorum, seu Distinctiones et axiomata a Georgio Reeb S. J. proposita a S. M. Cornoldi ejusdem Societatis recognita et aucta. Brixinae, 1871; ed. n., Paris, Lethielleux, 1875.
- Die antikatholische Philosophie und die gegenwärtige Uebel der Gesellschaft. Aus dem Italien. Brixen, Weger, 1871.
- Lezioni di filosofia, ordinate allo studio delle altre scienze. Firenze, 1872; 2. ed., Ferrara, 1875; Engl., London, 1876; Span., Barcelona, 1878; French par un Professeur du Grand-Séminaire. Paris, Lethielleux, 1878; 2. ed., 1888.
- Viribus unitis. Prolusione al periodico "La scienza italiana." Bologna, 1876.
- La Sintesi chimica secondo i principii filosofici di S. Tommaso d'Aquino. Bologna, 1876.
- Francisci Suarezii doctoris eximii: De corporum natura Tractatus. Bononiae, Mareggiani, 1877.
- Prolegomeni sopra la filosofia italiana o Trattato della esistenza di Dio. Bologna, Mareggiani, 1877.
- Della pluralità delle forme secondo i principii filosofici di San Tommaso d'Aquino. Bologna, 1877.
- La conciliazione della fede cattolica con la vera scienza; ossia Accademia filosofico-medica di S. Tommaso d'Aquino. Bologna, 1877; 2. ed. con appendice, 1878; Span. by J. F. Montaña; Madrid, 1878.
- Institutiones philosophiæ speculative ad mentem S. Thomæ Aquinatis, auctore J. M. Cornoldi S. J. in latinum versæ ab Exemo. et Revmo. Dominico Agostini Venetiarum Patriarcha et ab auctore recognite et auctæ. Bononia, 1878.
- Nozione elementare dell'Ontologismo. Bologna, 1878.
- Il Panteismo ontologico e le nozioni di Ontologia del M. R. G. Buroni. Bologna, Mareggiani, 1878.
- La storia del conflitto tra la religione e la scienza di G. Draper, prof. nell'Univ. di Nuova York. Ed. 2., Bologna, Mareggiani, 1879; Span., Madrid, 1879.
- La riforma della filosofia promossa dall'Enciclica Aeterni Patris di S. S. Leon Papa XIII. Bologna, Mareggiani, 1879.

- CORNOLDI, S.J., GIOVANNI MARIA. Il sette Marzo 1880, ossia i filosofi ai piedi di Leone XIII, ristoratore della filosofia. Bologna, 1880.
- La filosofia scolastica speculativa di San Tommaso d'Aquino. Bologna, 1881.
- Dei principii fisico-razionali secondo S. Tommaso d'Aquino. Commentario dell'Opusculo "De principiis naturæ." Bologna, 1881.
- Il Rosminianismo sintesi dell'Ontologismo e del Panteismo. Roma, Befani, 1881-83.
- Antitesi della dottrina di S. Tommaso con quella del Rosmini. Prato, Giachetti, 1882.
- Dell'unione dell'anima umana col corpo; Roma, Befani, 1882.
- Del senso comune e del senso fondamentale del Rosmini. Roma, Befani, 1882.
- La lotta del pensiero. Roma, Befani, 1882.
- L'intelletto agente. Roma, Befani, 1883.
- Della libertà umana. Dissertazione. Roma, Befani, 1883.
- La cognizione umana dei futuri. Roma, Befani, 1885.
- La filosofia di S. Tommaso e l'epoca presente. Prato, Giachetti, 1886.
- Esordio del concetto di Dio. Roma, 1887.
- La Creazione. Roma, Befani, 1888.
- La Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri, col commento di G. M. Cornoldi. Roma, Befani, 1888.
- La filosofia scolastica di San Tommaso e di Dante. Bologna, 1889.
- Esame critico del traducianismo. Roma, Befani, 1889.
- La visione dell'essenza divina. Roma, Befani, 1889.
- Quale secondo S. Tommaso sia la concordia della mozione divina colla libertà umana. 3. ed., Roma, Befani, 1890.
- Sistema fisico di San Tommaso. Roma, 1891; Engl. by E. H. Dering. London, 1893.
- Partenio. La creazione e la immacolata. Conversazioni scolastiche. Roma, Befani, 1891.
- DEL CORONA, P. A. I quattro cardini della felicità secondo San Tommaso d'Aquino. Firenze, 1874.
- CORRENS, P. Die dem Boethius fälschlich zugeschriebene Abhandlung des Dominicus Gundisalvi de unitate (Beiträge). Münster, 1891.
- CORTI, SETTIMIO. L'assurdità della metodica scolastica nell'insegnamento medio. Siena, 1907.
- COSTANZI. Un recente contributo di Ruggero Bacone. *Riv. int. di sci. sociali*, 1900.
- COSTA-ROSETTI, S.J., JULIUS. Philosophia moralis s. institutiones ethicae et juris naturæ secundum principia philosophiæ scholasticæ, præsertim S. Thomæ, Suarez et De Lugo methodo scholastica elucubratiæ. Geniponte, 1883; 2. ed., 1886.

- COSTA-ROSETTI, S.J., JULIUS. Allgemeine Grundlagen der National-Oekonomie. Beiträge zu einem System der National-Oekonomie im Geiste der Scholastik. Freiburg, Herder, 1888.
- Die Staatslehre der christlichen Philosophie. Fulda, Actiendruckerei, 1890.
- DE COSTER, J. Le problème de la finalité. Louvain, 1887.
- COUAILHAC, S.J., P. La liberté et la conservation de l'énergie. Paris, Lecoffre, 1897.
- Doctrina de ideis, divi Thomæ divique Bonaventuræ conciliatrix. Paris, 1897.
- COURTNEY, W. L. Studies in Philosophy. London, 1882.
- Roger Bacon. *Fortn. Rev.*, lii, 254.
- COUSIN, VICTOR. Ouvrages inédits d'Abélard. Paris, 1836.
- Fragments de philosophie du moyen âge. Paris, 1840; 5. ed., 1865.
- D'un ouvrage inédit de Roger Bacon. *J. des Savants*, 1848.
- Fragments philosophiques. Paris, 1850.
- COWEN, J. Roger Bacon. *Colburn's New Mo. Mag.*, clxv, 864.
- DE CRAENE, G. De la spiritualité de l'âme. Louvain, 1897.
- La connaissance de l'esprit. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1899.
- L'abstraction intellectuelle. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1901.
- CRABAY, E. La politique de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Louvain, 1896.
- DE CRESCENZIO, C. Scuole di Filosofia. 1866.
- CRÉTEUR, S. La philosophie du Ferrarais. Une définition de la vérité. *Rev. august.*, 1907.
- CREUSEN, S.J., J. Des Aristoteles Lehre über die Willensfreiheit. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1907.
- CROCIFERO, P. R. La filosofia di Augusto Conti e lo stato presente della scienza. Genova, 1895.
- CROLET, L. Doctrine philosophique de saint Thomas résumée d'après le Dr. Stoeckl. Paris, Roger, 1890.
- CROSET-MOUCHET, J. Saint Anselme. Histoire de sa vie et de son temps. Paris, 1859.
- CRUMLEY, C.S.C., T. Experimental Psychology in the College. *Rev. Cath. Pedag.*, 1903.
- CSEERNIK, A. Anyagrendszér erők nélkül. Szombathely, 1887.
- CUISSARD, CH. Documents inédits sur Abélard. Orléans, 1880.
- DE CURLEY, S.J., FRED. Celui qui est. Essai. Paris, Retaux, 1891.
- Cursus Philosophicus. In usum scholarum. Auctoribus pluribus Philosophiæ professoribus in Collegiis Exetensi et Stonylhurstensi S. J.; Freiburg, Herder, 1893-95. (Cf. Boedder, Cathrein, Frick, Haan.)
- DAGNEAUX, H. Leçons de métaphysique. Paris, Lethielleux, 1902.
- DAMIAN, J. A világ kezdetéről. *Böles. Foly.*, 1905.
- DANTIER. Un manuscrit autographe de saint Thomas d'Aquin. *Rev. contemp.*, 1857.

- DARLEY. L'accord de la liberté avec la conservation de l'énergie et saint Thomas. *Rev. thom.*, 1900.
- DAURELLA Y RUIA, J. Instituciones de Metafísica. Valladolid, Rodriguez, 1891.
- DAUX. Un scholastique du XII. siècle trop oublié: Honoré d'Autun. *Rev. sci. ecclés.*, 1907.
- DAVID. La philosophie de saint Thomas d'Aquin. *Correspondant*, 1859.
- DAVIDSON, TH. The Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas. *J. Specul. Phil.*, 1876.
- Revival of Thomas Aquinas. *Fortn. Rev.*, xxxviii, 16.
- DEDERICH, A. Beiträge zur römisch-deutschen Geschichte am Niederrhein. Anhang: das Leben des h. Willibrodus nach Aleuin. Emmerich, 1850.
- Definitiones ex Philosophia a S. Tongiorgi S. J. et in Collegio Romano Professore elucubrata, quoad majorem partem excerptæ. Editio nova. Zacatecarum, 1880.
- DEFOURNY, M. La sociologie positiviste. Auguste Comte. Louvain, 1902.
- DELACROIX, H. Essai sur le mysticisme spéculatif en Allemagne au XIV. siècle. Paris, Alcan, 1900.
- La philosophie médiévale latine jusqu'au XIV. siècle. *Rev. de synthèse histor.*, 1902.
- DELAUNAY, D. Sancti Thomæ de origine idearum doctrina. Paris, 1876.
- DELÉCLUZE, E. Vie de Raymond Lulle. *Rev. des Deux-Mondes*, 1840.
- Gregoire VII, saint Francois d'Assise et saint Thomas d'Aquin. Paris, 1844.
- DELENGRE, M. J. Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Un épisode de sa carrière universitaire à Paris. Paris, Lethielleux, 1904.
- DELITZSCH, J. Die Gotteslehre des Thomas von Aquino kritisch dargestellt. Leipzig, 1870.
- DELMAS, S.J., CAROLUS. Ontologia. Metaphysica Generalis. Paris, Retaux, 1896.
- DEMBÓ, G. A jog fogalma és eredete. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1905.
- DENIFLE, O.P., HEINRICH. Abaelard's Sentenzen und die Bearbeitung seiner Theologia. *Arch. f. Litteratur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, 1885.
- Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400. Berlin, 1885.
- Das geistliche Leben. Blumenlese aus den deutschen Mystikern und Gottesfreunden des 14. Jahrhunderts. 5. ed., Graz, Moser, 1904; French, Troyes, 1897.
- DENIFLE, O.P., H. AND A. CHATELAIN. Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis. Paris, 1889-91.
- DEPLOIGE, SIMON. La théorie thomiste de la propriété; Louvain, 1895.
- Saint Thomas et la question juive. Louvain, 1897.

- DEUTSCH, S. M. Die Synode von Sens, 1141. Berlin, 1880.
 Peter Abaelard, ein kritischer Theologen des zwölften Jahrhunderts.
 Leipzig, 1883.
- DEV, O.F.M., G. *Ethica generalis ad mentem venerabilis J. Scoti, Doctoris subtilis*. Friburgi, Herder, 1907.
- A Dialogue on the Late Encyclical on Liberty and the Light of Natural Reason. By a Thomist. London, Burns & Oates, 1888.
- DIBIO. Die moderne Moral und ihre Grundprincipien (Strassburger theolog. Studien, 11, 3). Freiburg, 1896.
- DIDIOT, JULES. *Le Docteur Angélique, saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Lille, 1894.
 Contribution philosophique à l'étude des sciences. Lille, 1902.
- A Discussion with an Infidel. Being a review of Dr. L. Büchner's "Force and Matter" by a Priest of the Society of Jesus. London, Art and Book Co., 1891.
- DOCTOR, MAX. Die Philosophie des Jozef (Ibn) Zaddik nach ihren Quellen, insbesondere nach ihren Beziehungen zu den lauterer Brüdern und zu Gabirol untersucht (Beiträge). Münster, 1895.
- DOMANSKI, B. Die Psychologie des Nemesius (Beiträge). Münster, 1900.
- DOMASZEWICZ, J. *Swiat i czlowiek, studyum dogmatyczne na potstawie sw. Tomasza*. Warszawa, 1899.
- DOMET DE VORGES, E. *La Métaphysique en présence des sciences*. Paris, 1875.
 Essai de métaphysique positive. Paris, 1883.
 La constitution de l'être suivant la doctrine péripatéticienne. Paris, 1886.
 Bibliographie de la philosophie thomiste de 1877 à 1887. *Ann. de Philos. chrét.*, 1888.
 Détermination des causes créées. *Ann. de Philos. chr.*, 1889.
 Cause efficiente et cause finale. Paris, 1890.
 La Perception et la Psychologie thomiste. Paris, Roger & Chernoviz, 1892.
 Les ressorts de la volonté et le libre arbitre. Bruxelles, 1895.
 L'objectivité de la connaissance intellectuelle d'après saint Thomas. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1896.
 Les certitudes de l'expérience. Paris, Roger & Chernoviz, 1898.
 A propos des Universaux. *Ann. de Philos. chr.*, 1898.
 La Philosophie thomiste pendant les années 1888–1898. Paris, Soc. bibliographique, 1899.
 L'argument de saint Anselme. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1901.
 Saint Anselme. Paris, Alcan, 1901.
 En quelle langue doit être enseignée la philosophie scolastique. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1903.

- DOMET DE VORGES, E. Considérations sur la "Critique de la Raison Pure." Arras, Sueur-Charruey, 1904.
 Abrégé de métaphysique, étude historique et critique des doctrines de la métaphysique scolastique, d'après les renseignements des principaux docteurs. 2 vol., Paris, Lethielleux, 1906.
 La Philosophie médiévale d'après M. Picavet. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1906.
- DOÑADU Y PUIGNAU. Ampliación de Psicología y nociones de Ontología, Cosmología y Teodicea. Barcelona, 1886.
 Curso de Metafísica. Barcelona, 1887.
- DONAT, S.J., JOS. Zur Frage über den Begriff des Schönen. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1900-1.
- DONATI, BERNARDINO. Intorno al panteismo, al materialismo ed al positivismo contemporanei, scritti vari. Siena, s. Bernardino.
 Il concetto materialistico della vita, per il dottore G. Romiti, Prof. di anatomia umana nella R. Università di Siena, esaminato dal Can. Dott. B. Donati. Siena, s. Bernardino.
- DOONAN, S.J., JAMES A. Some Elementary Studies in Psychology. *Cath. Read. Circle Rev.*, 1894-95.
- DÖRHOLT, B. Erklärung einer schwierigen Stelle der Qu. de Veritate des hl. Thomas. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1895.
 Zur mittelalterlichen Controverse über die unbefleckte Empfängniß. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1896.
 Der hl. Bonaventura und die thomistisch-molinistische Controverse. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1897.
- DOUAIS, G. Essai sur l'organisation des études dans l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs au XIII. et au XIV. siècle. Paris, 1884.
- DOUBLIER, L. Roger Bacon: eine culturgeschichtliche Studie. Wien. 1886.
- DOUGHERTY, J. T. Albertus Magnus. *Cath. World*, xxxvii.
- DRÄSEKE, JOH. Johannes Scotus Erigena und dessen Gewährsmänner in seinem Werke De Divisione Naturæ libri V. Leipzig, 1902.
- DRESSEL, S.J., L. Der belebte und der unbelebte Stoff. Freiburg-i-B. 1883.
- DRISCOLL, JOHN T. Christian Philosophy: A Treatise on the Human Soul. New York, Benziger, 1898; 3. ed., 1900.
 Christian Philosophy: God. New York, 1900.
 Philosophy and Science at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century. *North Amer. Rev.*, 1903.
 The Notion of Morality. *N. Y. Rev.*, 1906.
- DUMBAY, CHARLES. The Theory of Psychical Dispositions. The Macmillan Co., 1905.
 The New Psychology. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1907.
- DUFFY, FRANCIS. The Current Science-Philosophy. *New York Rev.*, 1907.

- DUHEM, P. L'évolution de la mécanique. Paris, 1903.
 Le mouvement absolu et le mouvement relatif. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1907.
- DUKES, LEOPOLD. Salomo ben Gebirol aus Malaga und die ethischen Werke desselben. Hannover, 1860.
 Philosophisches aus dem zehnten Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte der Mohameder und Juden. Nakel, 1868.
- DUMMERMUTH, O.P., A. M. S. Thomas et doctrina pramotionis physicae seu responsio ad R. P. Schneemann. Paris, Lethielleux, 1886.
 Defensio doctrinae Sancti Thomae Aq. de pramotione physica seu responsio ad R. P. V. Frins S. J. Louvain, 1896.
- DUMMLER, ERNST. Anselm der Peripatetiker, nebst anderen Beiträgen zur Literaturgeschichte Italiens im XI. Jahrh. Halle, 1872.
- V. DUNIN-BORKOWSKI, S.J., STANISLAUS. Neue philosophische Gebiete. *Stimm. aus Maria-Laach*, 1903.
- DUPARAY, B. Pierre le Vénérable, abbé de Cluny. Chalons-s-Saône, 1862.
- DUPEYRAT, A. Manuductio ad Scholasticam, maxime vero thomisticam philosophiam. Parisiis, Lecoffre, 1884; ed. 3., 1890.
- DUPONT. Thèses métaphysiques. Louvain, 1875.
 Philosophie de saint Augustin. Louvain, 1881.
 Spiritualité de l'âme. Lyon, 1885.
- DUPUIS, Alain de Lille. Etudes de philosophie scolastique. Lille, 1859.
- DUPUY, A. Alcuin et l'école de Saint Martin de Tours. Paris, 1876.
- DWIGHT, THOMAS. Matter and Form in Biology. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1892.
- DYROFF, AD. Ueber den Existenzbegriff. Freiburg-i-B., Herder, 1902.
- VON EBERSTEIN, W. L. G. F. Natürliche Theologie der Scholastiker. Leipzig, 1803.
- EBERT, A. Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande. Leipzig, 1880; 2. ed., 1889.
- EIHRENPREIS, MAX. Kabbalistische Studien. Frankfurt-o-M., 1896.
- EHRHARD. Der Katholicismus und das zwanzigste Jahrhundert im Lichte der kirchlichen Entwicklung der Neuzeit. Stuttgart, 1902.
- EISLER, MORITZ. Vorlesungen über die jüdischen Philosophen des Mittelalters. 2. Abtheilung; Wien, 1870.
 Vorlesungen über die jüdischen Philosophen des Mittelalters. 1. Abtheilung; Wien, 1876.
 Vorlesungen über die jüdischen Philosophen des Mittelalters. 3. Abtheilung; Wien, 1883.
- ELIZALDE E ISAGUIRRE, L. M. Compendio de psicología, lógica y ética. Madrid, 1886; 3. ed., 1902.
- ELLERO, GIUSEPPE. Le nuove tendenze del pensiero e l'atteggiamento del cattolicesimo al principio del secolo XX. Siena, s. Bernardino.
- ENDRES, J. A. Fredegisus und Candidus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Frühscholastik. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1906.

- ENDRES, J. A. Zum dritten Band der Epistole Karolini. *Archiv d. Gesellschaft f. aeltere deutsche Geschichte*, 1906.
- ENDRIS, GUSTAV. Albertus Magnus als Interpret der aristotelischen Metaphysik. München, 1886.
- ENGELKEMPER, W. Die Lehre Saadia Gaon's ueber die "Aufhebung des Gesetzes." Ein Capitel aus der arabisch-jüdischen Scholastik. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1900.
- ENGENHEIMER, JOS. Die Religionsphilosophie des R. Abraham ben-David-Ha-Levi. Augsburg, 1850.
- ENGLERT, W. *Philosophia Logica. Prima Pars Summæ Philosophiæ et operibus Angel. Doctoris S. Thomæ Aq. juxta eursum philos. Cosmi Alamanni instituta.* Paderborn, Schöning, 1901.
- ERCOLE, P. D. Il teismo filosofico eristiano, considerato con ispeciale riguardo a San Tommaso. Torino, 1884.
- ERIGENA, JOHANNES SCOTUS. De Divisione Naturæ libri quinque, ed. C. B. Schlüter. Monasterii Guestphalorum, 1838.
- De Joanne Scoto Erigena commendatio. Bonnæ, 1845.
- ERMONI, V. Existentia Dei et philosophus christianus. *Div. Thom.*, 1890-91.
- De principiis rationis speculativæ. *Div. Thom.*, 1892.
- Le Thomisme et les résultats de la psychologie expérimentale. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1898.
- De natura causæ et ejusdem notionis origine. *Div. Thom.*, 1900.
- De natura substantiæ. *Div. Thom.*, 1901.
- Necessité de la métaphysique. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1906.
- VAN ES, P. M. En woord van Pius IX over den hl. Thomas van Aquino uiteengezet. Utrecht, 1872.
- ESPAÑA LLEDO, JOS. Filosofía: Lógica. Madrid, Hernando, 1900.
- Filosofía: Psicología. Madrid, Hernando, 1900.
- Filosofía. (Ampliación al estudio de la lógica fundamental.) Metodología aristotélico-cristiana con la de los principales sistemas filosóficos. Madrid, Hernando, 1901.
- Filosofía. Nociones de Sociología. Madrid, Hernando, 1901.
- ESSENBERGER, JOH. NEP. Die Philosophie des Petrus Lombardus und ihre Stellung im zwölften Jahrhundert (Beiträge). Münster, 1901.
- ESPÍ, J. La metafísica y el empirismo. *Razón y Fé.*, 1902-3.
- ESSER, O.P., THOMAS. Rosminian Ontologism. *Dublin Rev.*, 1889.
- Die Lehre des hl. Thomas bezüglich der Möglichkeit einer ewigen Welschöpfung. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1890-92.
- Die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquino über die Möglichkeit einer anfangslosen Schöpfung. Münster, Aschendorff, 1895.
- EUCKEN, RUDOLF. Die Philosophie des Thomas von Aquino und die Cultur der Neuzeit. Halle, 1886.

- EUCKEN, RUDOLF. Neuthomismus und die neuere Wissenschaft. *Philos. Monatshefte*, 1888.
 Frohschammer's Thomas von Aquino. *Philos. Monatshefte*, 1890.
 Thomas von Aquino und Kant. Ein Kampf zweier Welten. *Kantstudien*, 1901; Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1901.
 Das wissenschaftliche Zentrum des heutigen Thomismus. München, 1904.
- EVANGELISTA, P. Conspectus principiorum fundamentalium philosophiæ speculativæ Seraphici Doctoris S. Bonaventuræ. *Dir. Thom.*, 1890.
- EZECHIELI A. S. C. JESU O. C. D. Annotationes in Summam D. Thomæ. De Deo Creante et Gubernante. Romæ, Pustet, 1903.
- FARGES, ALBERT. Théorie fondamentale de l'acte et de la puissance, du moteur et du mobile. Paris, 1886; 5. ed., 1900; Ital. by C. Boni, Siena, s. Bernardino, 1900.
 L'unité de principe pour les trois vies. *Ann. de Philos. chr.*, 1888.
 Matière et Forme en présence des sciences modernes. Paris, 1892; 4. ed., 1895; Ital. by C. Boni, Siena, s. Bernardino.
 La vie et l'évolution des espèces. Paris, 1892; 5. ed., 1900; Ital. by Elena, Torino, 1896.
 Le cerveau, l'âme et les facultés. Paris, 1892; 6. ed., 1900; Ital. by Silvio Monaci.
 L'objectivité de la perception des sens externes et les théories modernes. Paris, 1885; 4. ed., 1900; Ital. by R. Spada, Siena, s. Bernardino.
 L'idée de continu dans l'espace et dans le temps, réfutation du kantisme, du dynamisme et du réalisme. Paris, 1892; 4. ed., 1900.
 L'idée de Dieu d'après la raison et la science. Paris, 1894; 4. ed., 1900.
 La liberté et le devoir, fondements de la morale et critique des systèmes de morale contemporains. Paris, Berche & Tralin, 1902.
 La crise de la certitude. Etude des bases de la connaissance et de la croyance avec la critique du néo-kantisme, du pragmatisme, du newmanisme. Paris, Berche & Tralin, 1907.
 Le doute méthodique peut-il être universel? *Rev. de Philos.*, 1907.
 Le critère de l'évidence. *Rev. Thom.*, 1907.
 Comment il faut réfuter Kant. *Rev. Thom.*, 1907.
- FARGES, A., and BARREDETTE. Philosophia scholastica ad mentem S. Thomæ Aquinatis exposita et recentioribus scientiarum inventis aptata. Paris, Berche & Tralin, 1893.
- FARGUES. De Deo Uno. *Dir. Thom.*, 1902.
- FARRAR, F. W. Roger Bacon. *Sunday Mag.*, xix, 268.
 Thomas Aquinas. *Sunday Mag.*, xix, 634.
- FEILER, W. Die Moral des Albertus Magnus. Leipzig, Schmidt, 1891.

- FELCHLIN, B. Ueber den realen Unterschied zwischen Wesenheit und Dasein in den Geschöpfen nach St. Thomas. *Zeitsch. f. kath. Theol.*, 1892.
- FELDNER, GUNDISALY. Die Lehre des hl. Thomas über den Einfluss Gottes auf die Handlungen der vernünftigen Geschöpfe. Graz, 1889.
- Die Lehre des hl. Thomas über die Willensfreiheit der vernünftigen Wesen. Graz, 1890.
- Das Verhältniss der Wesenheit zu dem Dasein in den geschaffenen Dingen nach der Lehre des Thomas. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1890-92.
- Der neueste Commentator des hl. Thomas. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1891.
- Die potentia obedientialis der Creaturen. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1894.
- Die Neuthomisten. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1894-96.
- Der Urstoff oder die erste Materie. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1897.
- Das Werden im Sinne der Scholastik. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1904.
- Das innerste Wesen der Sittlichkeit nach S. Thomas v. Aquin. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1904.
- FELL, S.J., GEORG. Die Unsterblichkeit der menschlichen Seele philosophisch beleuchtet. Freiburg-i-B., Herder, 1892.
- FERET. La Faculté de Théologie de Paris. Paris, 1894.
- L'aristotélisme et le cartésianisme dans l'université de Paris au XVII. siècle. *Ann. Philos. chr.*, 1903.
- FERNÁNDEZ, F. Doctrinas jurídicas de Santo Tomás de Aquino. Madrid, 1888.
- FERNÁNDEZ CONCHA, RAFAEL. Filosofia del Derecho, o Derecho Natural dispuesto para servir de introducción á las ciencias legales. 2. ed., Barcelona, 1887.
- DE FERRARI, G. Vita del beato Alberto Magno dell'ordine de'Predicatori. Roma, 1847.
- FERRATA, ANG. Osservazioni sulle leggi della conoscenza. Roma, Cuginiani, 1891.
- FERRÉ, C. M. Saint Thomas of Aquin and Ideology. London, 1875; French, Paris, 1876.
- Degli universali secondo la teoria rosminiana confrontata colla dottrina di San Tommaso d'Aquino. Casale, 1880.
- FERRERA-DEUSDADO. La philosophie thomiste en Portugal. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1898.
- FERRETTI, S.J., AUG. Institutiones philosophiæ moralis. Romæ, 1887; 2. ed., 1895.
- FERRI, LUIGI. L'Accademia romana di San Tommaso e l'istruzione filosofica del clero. *Nuova Antologia*, 2. serie, xxiv, 1880.
- FERRIS, J. On Right and Wrong. *Irish Eccles. Rev.*, 1907.
- FESTUGIÈRE. Questions de philosophie de la nature. *Rev. bônéd.*, 1904.
- FEUERBACH, LUDW. Abélard und Heloise. Ansbach, 1834; 4. ed., 1889.

- FEUGUERAY, H. R. Essai sur les doctrines politiques de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Paris, 1857.
- FIGUIER. Vies des savants du moyen âge. Paris, 1883.
- FISICHELLA, A. San Tommaso d'Aquino, Leone XIII e la scienza. Catania, 1880.
- FÖLDES, B. A socializmus fejlődése. Budapest, 1903.
- FOLGHERA, O.P., J. D. La vérité définie par saint Anselme. *Rev. Thom.*, 1900.
- Hasard ou Providence. Le problème des causes finales. Paris, Bloud & Barral, 1900.
- Le libre arbitre. *Rev. Thom.*, 1903.
- FOLGHERA, O.P., T. D. God's Happiness and Ours. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1907.
- FONSEGRIVE, GEORGES. Essai sur le libre arbitre: sa théorie et son histoire. Paris, Alcan, 1887; 2. ed., 1896; Span. by González Carreño, Madrid, 1907.
- Elements de philosophie. Paris, Picard, 1891.
- La causalité efficiente. Paris, Alcan, 1893.
- FONTAINE, TH. De la sensation et de la pensée. Louvain, 1885.
- FORGET, J. Un chapitre inédit de la philosophie d'Avicenne. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1894.
- De l'influence de la philosophie arabe sur la philosophie scolastique. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1894.
- FORNELLI, N. False Previsioni. Studio di psicologia scolastica. *Riv. Filos.*, 1900.
- FOX, JAMES J. Religion and Morality. Their Nature and Mutual Relations historically and doctrinally considered. New York, W. H. Young & Co., 1899.
- Scotus Redivivus. *New York Rev.*, 1905.
- FRANCHI, AUSONIO. Ultima critica. Milano, 1889; 2. ed., 1890.
- FRANCISCY, L. Az ethikai determinizmus és indeterminizmusról. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1890.
- Az egyeduralmi kormány forma aquinoi szt. Tamás tana szerint. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1891.
- Az aktualizmus a lélektanban. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1898.
- FRANCK, AD. Guillaume Ockam et les Franciscains au XIV. siècle. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Mor. et Pol.*, 1864.
- La Kabbale ou la philosophie religieuse des Hébreux. N. ed., Paris, 1889.
- FRANCK, G. F. Anselm von Canterbury. Tübingen, 1842.
- FRÉDAULT. Forme et Matière. Paris, 1876.
- FREUDENTHAL, J. Spinoza und die Scholastik. Leipzig, 1887.
- Zur Beurtheilung der Scholastik. *Archiv f. Geschichte der Philos.*, 1890.
- FREY, J. A természetjog léte. Pécs, 1904.

- FRICK, S.J., CAROLUS. *Logica*. Friburgi, Herder, 1893; ed. 3., 1902.
Ontologia sive metaphysica generalis. Friburgi, Herder, 1894; ed. 2., 1897.
- FRINS, S.J., VICTOR. *Thomæ Aquinatis doctrina de cooperatione Dei cum omni creatura præsertim libera*. Paris, Lethielleux, 1893.
De actibus humanis ontologice et psychologice consideratis seu disquisitiones psychologica-theologicae de voluntate in ordine ad mores. Friburgi, Herder, 1897.
De actibus humanis moraliter consideratis. Friburgi, Herder, 1904.
- FROHSCHAMMER, JAKOB. *Ueber das Recht der neuen Philosophie gegenüber der Scholastik*. München, 1863.
Die Philosophie des Thomas von Aquino kritisch gewürdigt. Leipzig, 1889.
- FROST, F. *The "Art de Contemplacio" of Ramon Lull, published with an introduction and a study of the language of the author*. Baltimore, 1903.
- GABORIT, P. *De la connaissance du beau*. Paris, Bloud & Barral, 1899.
Le beau dans les œuvres littéraires. Paris, Bloud & Barral, 1900.
- GABBYL, FR. *Zum Begriff des Absoluten*. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1902.
- GALDI, F. M. *Institutiones philosophicae complectentes logicam et metaphysicam*. Bononiae, 1893.
- GALLOVICH, E. *Létért való küzdelem*. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1904.
- GARCÍA, O.P., GUILLERMO. *Tomismo y. Neotomismo*. San Luis Potosí, 1903; 2. ed., 1905.
El Seráfico Doctor San Buenaventura. San Luis Potosí, 1906.
- GARCÍA, M. F. *Lexicon Scholasticum Philosophico-Theologicum in quo continentur termini, definitiones, distinctiones et effata a B. Joanne Duns Scoto Doctore Subtili*. Quaracchi, 1906.
- GARCÍA HERRERO, S.J., CL. *La libertad y el determinismo*. Bilbao, 1903.
- GARCÍA DE LOS SANTOS, B. *Vida de Balmes*. Madrid, 1848.
- GARDAIR, J. *L'activité dans les corps inorganiques*. Paris, 1884.
La Matière et la Vie. Paris, 1885.
Les puissances de l'âme. Paris, 1886.
L'accord du libre arbitre avec la prescience et l'action de Dieu. *Ann. Philos. chr.*, 1889.
Corps et âme. Essais sur la philosophie de saint Thomas. Paris, Lethielleux, 1892.
Les passions et la volonté. Paris, Lethielleux, 1892.
La Philosophie morale et la réforme sociale. *Ann. de Philos. chrét.*, 1893.
Philosophie de saint Thomas: La Connaissance. Paris, Lethielleux, 1895.
Philosophie de saint Thomas: La Nature Humaine. Paris, Lethielleux, 1896.
Pensées philosophiques du Dr. Fournet. Paris, 1900.

- GARDAIR, J. Les Vertus naturelles. Paris, Lethielleux, 1901.
 La Philosophie et le Dogme. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1902.
 La formation des idées. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1906.
 L'être divin. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1906.
 La transcendence de Dieu. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1907.
 L'infinité divine. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1907.
- GARDEIL, AMBR. L'évolution et les principes de saint Thomas. *Rev. Thom.*, 1893.
 Ce qu'il y a de vrai dans le néo-scotisme. *Rev. Thom.*, 1900-1.
- GARDNER, ALICE. Studies in John the Scot (Erigena), a Philosopher of the Dark Ages. London, Frowde, 1900.
- GARGIULO, FR. B. Del sistema scientifico di San Tommaso d'Aquino. Sansevero, 1898.
- GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, O.P., R. Le Dieu fini du pragmatisme. *Rev. sci. philos. et théol.*, 1907.
 Les preuves thomistes de l'existence de Dieu critiquées par M. Le Roy. *Rev. thom.*, 1907.
 Intellectualisme et liberté chez saint Thomas. *Rev. Sci. Philos. et Théol.*, 1907.
 Le Panthéisme de la "Philosophie nouvelle" et la preuve de la transcendence divine. *Rev. thom.*, 1907.
- GASQUET, J. R. The Present Position of the Arguments for the Existence of God. *Dublin Rev.*, 1885.
- GAUDENZI, T. San Tommaso d'Aquino e la scienza. Bologna, 1874.
- GAYRAUD, HIPPOLYTE. Le thomisme et le molinisme. Paris, Lethielleux, 1889.
 Providence et libre arbitre selon saint Thomas. Exposition du thomisme. Toulouse, Privat, 1892.
 Matière et Forme. *Ann. de Philos. chr.*, 1894.
 Saint Thomas et le prédéterminisme. Paris, Lethielleux, 1895.
 L'antisémitisme de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Paris, Dentu, 1896.
 Questions du jour, politiques, sociales, religieuses, philosophiques. Paris, Bloud, 1898.
- GEIGER, ABR. Moses ben Maimon. Rosenberg, 1850.
- GEMELLI, AG. La volontà nel pensiero del Ven. G. Duns Scoto. *Scuola cattol.*, 1906.
 Del valore dell'esperimento in psicologia. *Scuola cattol.*, 1906.
 Su un nuovo indirizzo della teoria dell'evoluzione. *Scuola cattol.*, 1906.
 Il Kantismo di Duns Scoto. La Verna, 1907.
 Per il progresso degli studi scientifici fra i cattolici italiani. *Studium*, 1907.
- GÉRARD, P. La cosmographie d'Albert le Grand d'après l'observation et l'expérience du moyen âge. *Rev. thom.*, 1904-5.

- GERDILIUS, H. S. Institutiones philosophiæ H. S. Gerdilii in usum seminariorum, nunc primum editæ studio Caroli Vercellone sod. Barnabitiæ. Romæ, 1867.
- GERBARD, THOMAS J. Divine Personality. *New York Rev.*, 1907.
Dichotomy: a Study in Newman and Aquinas. *N. Y. Rev.*, 1908.
- GETINO, O.P., L. G. A. La Summa contra Gentes y el Pugio Fidei; carta sin sobre á D. M. Asín y Palacios. Vergara, 1905.
- GEYSER, J. Wie erklärt Thomas von Aquin unsere Wahrnehmung der Aussenwelt? *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1899.
Lehrbuch der allgemeinen Psychologie. Münster, 1908.
- GIBBONS, J. C. The Philosophy of the Human Soul. London, Sands, 1908.
- GIESWEIN, A. Az összehasonlító nyelvészet főproblémái. Győr, 1891.
Beszéd és gondolkodás. *Böcs. Foly.*, 1892.
Mit tartunk a spiritisztikus jelenségek objektív valódiságáról? *Böcs. Foly.*, 1904.
- GIETMANN, S.J., GERARD. Grundriss der Stilistik, Poetik und Aesthetik. 1897.
- GIETMANN, S.J., G. and J. SÖRENSEN, S.J. Kunstlehre. Freiburg, Herder, 1900.
- GINEBBA, S.J., FRANCISCO. Elementos de Filosofia. Santiago de Chile, 1887; 2. ed., 1891; 1. ed. de Bogotá (with Introduction by Marco F. Suárez), 1893.
Elementos de Ética y de Derecho Natural. Santiago de Chile, 1889; 3. ed., Barcelona, 1894.
- GLOSSNER, MICHEL. Die Lehre des hl. Thomas vom Wesen der göttlichen Gnade. Mainz, 1871.
Das objective Princip der aristotelisch-scholastische Philosophie, besonders Alberts des Gr. Lehre vom object. Ursprung der intellectuellen Erkenntniss. Regensburg, 1880.
Der moderne Idealismus. Münster, 1880.
Das Princip der Individuation nach der Lehre des hl. Thomas und seiner Schule. Paderborn and Münster, 1887.
Zur Frage nach d. Einfluss der Scholastik auf die neuere Philosophie. *Jahr. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1889.
Die moderne Philosophie. Frankfurt-a-M., 1889.
Die philosophischen Reformversuche des Nikolaus Cusanus und M. Nizolius. *Jahr. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1889-90.
Die Philosophie des hl. Thomas v. Aquin. Gegen Frohschammer. *Jahr. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1893-94.
Der Gottesbegriff in der neuen und neuesten Philosophie. Paderborn, Schöning, 1894.
Des Card. Pasmany Physik. *Jahr. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1896.
Albert Barberis. *Jahr. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1898.
Phantasterei oder Schwindel? *Jahr. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1898.

- GLOSSNER, MICHEL. Scholastik, Reformkatholicismus und Reform-katholische Philosophie. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1899.
- GMEINER, JOHN. Modern Scientific Views and Christian Doctrines Compared. Milwaukee, Yewdale, 1884.
- Leo XIII and the Philosophy of St. Thomas. *Cath. World*, 1887.
- Mediaeval and Modern Cosmology. Milwaukee, Hoffmann, 1891.
- COMBAULT, F. L'avenir de l'hypnose. Réflexions philosophiques, théologiques, physiologiques sur la nature et les effets du sommeil provoqué. Paris, Beauchesne, 1895.
- Dialogues philosophico-théologiques sur la Providence. Paris, Beauchesne, 1896.
- L'Imagination et les états préternaturels, étude psycho-physiologique et mystique. Blois, 1899.
- GÓMEZ IZQUIERDO, ALBERTO. La restauración de la escolástica en Francia. *Rev. de Aragón*, 1903.
- La filosofía escolástica en Alemania y otros países. *Rev. de Aragón*, 1903.
- El escolasticismo en Bélgica. *Rev. de Aragón*, 1903.
- La escuela filosófica de Lovaina. *Rev. de Aragón*, 1903.
- Historia de la Filosofía del siglo XIX. *Zaragoza*, 1903.
- Un filósofo catalán: Antonio Comellas y Cluet. *Cultura española*, 1907.
- Nuevas direcciones de la lógica. Madrid, Suárez, 1907.
- GONTIER, M. P. De la méthode des sciences philosophiques dans les petits et les grands séminaires. Bayeux, 1905.
- GONZÁLEZ DE ARINTERO, O.P., J. La evolución y la filosofía cristiana. Gijón, 1898.
- La Providencia y la evolución. Valladolid, Cuesta, 1904.
- GONZÁLEZ Y DÍAZ-TUÑÓN, O.P., Z. Estudios sobre la Filosofía de Santo Tomás. Manila, 1864; 2. ed., Madrid, 1886.
- Philosophia elementaria ad usum academiae ac praesertim ecclesiasticae juventutis. Matriti, Lopez, 1868; ed. 7., 1894.
- Estudios religiosos, filosóficos, científicos y sociales. Madrid, 1873.
- Historia de la Filosofía. Madrid, 1879; 2. ed., 1886; French by G. de Pascal, Paris, 1890-91.
- Filosofía elemental. 6. ed., Madrid, 1894.
- La Biblia y la Ciencia. Madrid, 1891.
- GOSSARD, M. Linéaments d'une synthèse scolastique des mœurs. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1906.
- GÖTTIG, F. Das Verhältniss der philosophischen und theologischen Tugenden, mit Zugrundlegung der Tugendlehre des Thomas v. Aquin. Kiel, 1840.
- GOUDIN, ANTONIO. Philosophia juxta inconcussa tutissimamque D. Thomae dogmata, logicam, physicam, moralem et metaphysicam quatuor tomis complectens. Novissime recensuit et edidit Roux-Lavergne. Parisiis, 1851; n. ed., 1861.

- GOUIN, A. Elements de Philosophie chrétienne. Paris, Lethielleux.
- GOUJON, H. Kant et Kantistes; études critiques selon les principes de la métaphysique thomiste. Lille, Morel, 1901.
- Les ennemis de la raison, la philosophie de la volonté et l'apologie de l'immanence. 1904.
- GRAMMANN, MARTIN. Streiflichter über Ziel und Weg des Studiums der thomistischen Philosophie mit besonderer Bezugnahme auf moderne Probleme. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1899.
- Der Genius der Schriften des hl. Thomas und die Gottesidee. Paderborn, 1899.
- Dr. Franz P. v. Morgott, als Thomist. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1900.
- Die Lehre des Johannes Teutonicus O. P. ueber den Unterschied von Wesenheit und Dasein. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1902.
- Die philosophische und theologische Erkenntnisslehre des Kardinals Matthäus von Aquasparta. Wien, 1906.
- GRANATO, F. I principii dell'ateismo contemporaneo e San Tommaso d'Aquino. Napoli, 1877.
- GRANDCLAUDE. Breviarium philosophiæ scholasticæ. Paris, 1868; 8. ed., 1886.
- DE GRANDMAISON. Sur l'apologétique de saint Thomas. *Nouvelle Rev. Théol.*, 1907.
- GREDT, O.S.B., JOS. Das Erkennen. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1898.
- Elementa philosophiæ aristotelico-thomisticæ. Romæ, 1899 ff.
- Homogénéité ou hétérogénéité du mixte. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1907.
- GRIMMICH, O.S.B., VIRG. Lehrbuch der theoretischen Philosophie auf thomistischer Grundlage. Freiburg, Herder, 1893.
- VAN DE GROOT, O.P., J. Het leven van den H. Thomas van Aquino. Utrecht, Van Rossum, 1882.
- Summa apologetica de ecclesia catholica ad mentem S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Regensburg, 1890.
- De philosophia S. Thomæ Aquinatis. *Div. Thomas*, 1890-91.
- De auctoritate Aristotelis. *Div. Thom.*, 1891.
- De h. Thomas van Aquino als wijsgeer. Amsterdam, 1894.
- Saint Thomas d'Aquin et sa philosophie. *Rev. thom.*, 1894.
- Leo XIII en de H. Thomas van Aquino. Utrecht, 1895; German by B. J. Fuss, Regensburg, 1897.
- Levenswijding. Drie voordrachten uitgesproken te Leuven voor het Sint-Thomas Genootschap der Studenten van de katholieke Hoogeschool. Amsterdam, 1900.
- Het leven van den h. Thomas van Aquino, tweede geheel herziene druk. Utrecht, 1907.
- GROSSMANN, LOUIS. Maimonides. New York and London, Putnam, 1890.
- GRUBER, S.J., HERMANN. August Comte, der Begründer des Positivismus. Sein Leben und seine Lehre. Freiburg, Herder, 1899; French by Mazoyer, Paris, Lethielleux, 1892.

- GRUBER, S.J., HERMANN. Der Positivismus vom Tode August Comte's bis auf unsere Tage. Freiburg, Herder, 1891; French by Mazoyer, Paris, Lethielleux, 1893.
- GRUENDER, S.J., HUBERTUS. Compendium Philosophiæ Scholasticæ, quod nostris collegiis accommodavit P. H. Gruender, S.J., Lector Philosophiæ in Collegio Sti. Joannis, Toledo, O. Vol. 1. Dialectica et Critica. For private circulation only.
- GRUNWALD, GEORG. Geschichte der Gottesbeweise im Mittelalter bis zum Ausgung der Hochscholastik (Beiträge). Münster, 1907.
- GUADAGNIN, G. Della umana felicità secondo la dottrina di San Tommaso d'Aquino. Treviso, 1883.
- GUENTIN, G. Le libre arbitre. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1906.
- GUILLERMIN. Saint Thomas et le prédéterminisme. Paris, 1895.
- GUIZOT, F. P. G. Abailard et Héloïse, essai historique. Paris, 1839.
- GUTBERLET, CONSTANTIN. Das Unendliche metaphysisch und mathematisch betrachtet. Mainz, 1878.
- Das Gesetz von der Erhaltung der Kraft u. seine Erziehungen zur Metaphysik. Münster, 1882.
- Die neue Raumtheorie. Mainz, 1882.
- Die Descendenztheorie auf Logik und Thatsachen geprüft. 1887.
- Die Aufgabe der christlichen Philosophie in der Gegenwart. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1888.
- Der Kampf um die Willensfreiheit. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1889-91.
- Lehrbuch der Philosophie. 2. ed., Münster, 1890; 3. ed., 1897.
- Logik und Erkenntnisstheorie. 3. ed., Münster, Theissing, 1898.
- Allgemeine Metaphysik. 3. ed., Münster, Theissing, 1897.
- Naturphilosophie. 3. ed., Münster, 1900.
- Die Psychologie. Münster, 1896.
- Die Theodicee. Münster, Theissing, 1890; 3. ed., 1897.
- Ethik und Naturrecht. 3. ed., Münster, Theissing, 1901.
- Ethik und Religion. Münster, 1892.
- Der mechanische Monismus. Paderborn, 1893.
- Die Willensfreiheit und ihre Gegner. Fulda, 1893; 2. ed., 1907.
- Thomas von Aquin und Immanuel Kant. *Der Kath.*, 1893.
- Ist die Seele Thätigkeit oder Substanz? *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1896.
- Der Mensch, sein Ursprung und seine Entwicklung. Paderborn, 1896.
- Der Kampf um die Seele. Vorträge über die brennenden Fragen der mod. Psychologie. Mainz, Kirchheim, 1899.
- Teleologie und Causalität. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1900-1.
- Eine neue actualistische Seelentheorie. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1901.
- Der Voluntarismus. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1903.
- Eine Ethik des freien Willens. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1906.
- Die Substanz als Bewegungsmelodie. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1907.
- Der gegenwärtige Stand der psychologischen Forschung. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1908.

- GUTTMANN, J. Die Philosophie des Salomon ibn Gabirol (Avicbron) dargestellt und erläutert. Göttingen, 1889.
- Das Verhältniss des Thomas von Aquino zum Judenthum und zur jüdischen Literatur. Göttingen, 1891.
- Die Scholastik des XIII. Jahrh. in ihren Beziehungen zum Judenthum. Breslau, Marens, 1902.
- GUYETON, L. L'argument de saint Anselme. *Ann. Philos. chr.*, 1894.
- HAAN, S.J., HEINR. *Philosophia naturalis in usum scholarum*. Friburgi, Herder, 1894; ed. 3., 1906.
- HAAS, LOR. Moralstatistik und Willensfreiheit. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1898.
- Die immaterielle Substantialität der menschlichen Seele. Regensburg, 1903.
- Ueber den Unterschied, näherhin über den Unterschied von Wesenheit und Dasein. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1905.
- HARRICH, L. Leven en Ziel, twee voordrachten vertaald uit het duitseh door G. Simeons. Brugge, 1907.
- HADZSEGA, B. Lénytan. Ungvár, 1904.
- HAFFNER, PAUL. Grundlinien der Philosophie. Mainz, 1881-84.
- HAGEMANN, GEORG. Elemente der Philosophie. 1. Theile. Logik und Noetik. 2. Theil. Metaphysik. 3. Theil. Psychologie. 6. ed., Freiburg, Herder, 1894-97.
- HAHN, Almarich von Bena. Theol. Studien u. Kritiken; Hamburg. 1846.
- HAHN, S. Thomas Bradwardinus und seine Lehre von des menschlichen Willensfreiheit (Beiträge). Münster, 1905.
- HAHN, WILH. Die Entstehung der Weltkörper, im Sinne der bezüglichen Rundschreiben Leo's XIII untersucht und für Gebildete aller Stände beleuchtet. München, 1895.
- HAJÓS, A. *Altalános psychopathologia*. Budapest, 1904.
- HALLEUX, JEAN. Les principes du positivisme contemporain. Exposé et critique. Louvain. Peeters, 1897.
- L'évolutionisme en morale. Paris, Alcan, 1901.
- Les Preuves de l'existence de Dieu. A propos d'un livre récent sur l'existence de Dieu. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1906-7.
- HAMMERSTEIN, S.J., L. Gottesbeweise. Eine Ergänzung zu Edgar oder vom Atheismus zur vollen Wahrheit. Trier, 1891.
- HAMPDEN, RENN DICKSON. The Scholastic Philosophy in its Relation to Christian Theology. Oxford, 1832.
- HANEBERG, B. Zur Erkenntnißlehre des Ibn Sina und Albertus Magnus. *Abhandl. d. philos. philol. Cl. der k. bayr. Akad. d. Wiss.*, München, 1866.
- HARGROVE, C. Saint Thomas Aquinas. *Mod. Rev.*, 1880.
- HARPER, S.J., THOMAS. Evidence and Certainty in their Relation to Conceptual Truth. Manchester, 1876.

- HARPER, S. J., THOMAS. The Schools of Charles the Great. *Month*, 1877.
 The Encyclical. *Month*, 1879.
 The Metaphysics of the Schools. London, 1879-84.
 The Word. *Mind*, 1883.
 From Logic to God. *Dublin Rev.*, 1884.
- HARTMANN, E. Die sinnliche Wahrnehmung nach Pierre d'Ailly. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1903.
- HASSE, FR. RUD. Anselm von Canterbury. Leipzig, 1843-52; Engl. by W. Turner, London, 1850.
 De ontologico Anselmi pro existentia Dei argumento. Bonn, 1849.
- HAURÉAU, BARTHÉLEMY. De la philosophie scolastique. Paris, 1850.
 Hugues de Saint-Victor. Nouvel examen de l'édition de ses œuvres, avec deux opuscules inédits. Paris, 1859.
 Histoire de la philosophie scolastique. Paris, 1872-80.
 Les œuvres de Hugues de Saint-Victor. Essai critique. Paris, Hachette, 1887.
 Des poèmes latins attribués à saint Bernard. Paris, 1890.
 Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Paris, 1891.
- HAUSRATH, A. Peter Abälard. Ein Lebensbild. Leipzig, 1893.
- HAVATY. Analyse der Philosophie des hl. Thomas von Aquino. 1885.
- HAYD, H. Abälard und seine Lehre. Regensburg, 1863.
- HECKER, I. T. The True and the False Friends of Reason. *Cath. World*, 1881.
 Thomistic-Rosminian Emersonianism; or "A Religion for Italy." *Cath. World*, 1884.
- HEDDE, R. Relations des sciences profanes avec la philosophie et la théologie. *Rev. thom.*, 1903-5.
 Nominalisme et Réalisme. *Rev. thom.*, 1907.
- HEIDMANN, K. Der Substanzbegriff von Abälard bis Spinoza. Berlin, 1890.
- HEITZ, TH. La Philosophie et la Foi dans l'œuvre d'Abélard. *Rev. Sci. Philos. et Théol.*, 1907.
 La philosophie et la foi chez les disciples d'Abélard. *Rev. sci. phi. et théol.*, 1908.
- HELFFERICH, AD. Die christliche Mystik. Gotha, 1842.
 Raymundus Lullus. Berlin, 1858.
- HEMAN, C. J. Die Erscheinung der Dinge in der Wahrnehmung. Leipzig, 1881.
- HERBERMANN, CHARLES G. The Myths of the "Dark" Ages. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1888.
- HERMENS, OSKAR. Das Leben des Scotus Erigena. Jena, 1868.
- HERNÁNDEZ Y FAJARNÉS, ANTONIO. Psicología celular. Zaragoza, 1884.
 Estudios críticos sobre la filosofía positiva. 1884 ff.
 Reforma de la Cosmología. Zaragoza, 1889.

- HERNÁNDEZ Y FAJARNÉS, ANTONIO. Principios de Metafísica: Ontología, 1887; Psicología, 1889; Cosmología, 1893.
 Programa de lógica fundamental. Madrid, 1906.
 Principios de lógica fundamental. Madrid, 1906.
- VON HERTLING, G. F. Albertus Magnus und die Wissenschaft seiner Zeit. *Histor. pol. Blätter*, 1874.
 Albertus Magnus. Beiträge zu seiner Würdigung. Köln, 1880.
 Descartes' Beziehungen zur Scholastik. München, 1899.
 Christenthum und griechische Philosophie. München, 1901.
- HERWIG, EMIL. Ueber den ontologischen Beweis. Rostock, 1868.
- HETTINGER, FR. Thomas von Aquin und die europäische Civilisation. Frankfurt-a-M., 1880; 2. ed., 1898.
 Timotheus, Briefe an einen jungen Theologen. Freiburg, 1897;
 Engl. by V. Stepka, St. Louis, Herder, 1902.
- HETTWER, JOH. De fidei et scientiarum discrimine et consortio juxta mentem Hugonis a Sancto Victore. Vratislavia, 1875.
- HEWIT, C.S.P., A. F. The Christian Agnostic and the Christian Gnostic. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1891.
 The Stonyhurst Philosophical Series. *Cath. World*, 1891.
 The Theodicy of Aristotle. *Amer. Eccles. Rev.*, 1892-93.
 The Essential Goodness of God. *Cath. World*, 1893.
- HICKEY, J. S. Summula philosophiæ scholasticæ in usum adolescentium Seminarii Beate Mariæ de Monte Melleario concinnata. Dublinii, 1902-5.
- HILL, S.J., WALTER H. Elements of Philosophy, comprising Logic and Ontology, or General Metaphysics. Baltimore, 1873.
 Origin of Ideas; or, concerning the manner and the order in which the human mind naturally acquires knowledge. What philosophical system most faithfully describes the operation of the mind in thinking? *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1876.
 Can the Immateriality, Spirituality, and Immortality of the Human Soul be Demonstrated? *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1877.
 Ethics, or Moral Philosophy. Baltimore, Murphy, 1878; 7th ed., 1896.
 The Human Soul and Body. Their union considered with reference to different theories for explaining the nature of material substance. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1879.
 Number of the External Senses: What use man's reason can make of their manifestations as data. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1891.
 Conscious Acts. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1892.
- HILL, T. John Scotus Erigena. *Christ. Exam.*, xlvii.
- HIRSCH, B. A. Roger Bacon as an Hebraist. *Jewish Quart.*, xii.
- HJORT, PETER. Johann Scotus Erigena, oder von dem Ursprung einer christlichen Philosophie und ihrem heiligen Beruf. Kopenhagen, 1823.

- HOFFMANN, F. J. Der Gottes- und Schöpfungsbegriff des Joh. Scotus Erigena. Jena, 1876.
- HOFFMANN, P. HADELIN. La synthèse doctrinale de Roger Bacon. *Archiv f. Gesch. der Philos.*, 1907.
- HOFFMANN, R. De Johannis Scoti Erigenae vita et doctrina. Halle, 1877.
- HOGAN, J. B. Clerical Studies. Boston, 1899; Ital. by P. Pereiballi, with Introd. by P. Semeria; French by A. Boudinhon, with Introd. by Mgr. Mignot; Paris, Lethielleux, 1901.
- HÖGL, M. Vernunft und Religion. Mit oberhirtlicher Druckgenehmigung. Regensburg, 1901.
- HÖHNE, AEMILIUS. Anselmi Cantuariensis philosophia cum aliorum illius ætatis decretis comparatur ejusdemque de satisfactione doctrina dijudicatur. Leipzig, 1867.
- HOLAIND, S.J., RENE I. Natural Law and Legal Practice. Lectures delivered at the Law School of Georgetown University. New York, Benziger, 1899.
- HOLLBERG, FR. De theologia naturali Raymundi de Sabunde. Halle, 1843.
- HOLLENBERG, W. A. Studien zu Bonaventura. Berlin, 1862.
- VON HOLTUM, O.S.B., GREGOR. Zur logischen Lehre vom Satze. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1894.
- Philosophisch-theologische Aphorismen. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1898.
- Die Natur der Seelensubstanz und ihrer Potenzen. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1900.
- Thierisches und menschliches Erkennen. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1901.
- Das Angenehme und das Gute. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1904.
- Die scholastische Philosophie in ihrem Verhältniss zu Wissenschaft, Philosophie und Theologie, mit besond. Berücksichtigung der modernen Zeit. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1905-6.
- HONTHEIM, S.J., JOS. Institutiones theodicæ sive theologiæ naturalis secundum principia S. Thomæ Aquinatis ad usum scolasticum. Friburgi Brisgoviae, Herder, 1893.
- Der logische Algorithmus in seinem Wesen, in seiner Anwendung und in seiner philosophischen Bedeutung. Berlin, 1895.
- HOPPE, G. Die Psychologie des J. L. Vives. Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1901.
- HOURLCADE, REMI. Essence et existence, à propos d'un livre récent. *Bu. l. eccl.*, 1908.
- HUBER, JOHANNES. Johannes Scotus Erigena. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie im Mittelalter. München, 1861.
- HUBER, SEB. Die Glückseligkeitslehre des Aristoteles und hl. Thomas von Aquin. Ein historisch-kritischer Vergleich. Freising, 1893.
- Grundzüge der Logik und Noetik im Geiste des hl. Thomas von Aquin. Paderborn, Schöningh, 1906.

- HÜBNER, J. Az exakt tudományok problémái. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1893.
 Alvás és álom. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1900.
- HUET, FRANÇOIS. Recherches historiques et critiques sur la vie, les ouvrages et la doctrine de Henri de Gand. Gand, 1838.
- HUGON, O.P., Ed. Cursus philosophiæ thomistiæ. Paris, Lethielleux, 1906 ff.
- VON HÜGEL, FR. Experience and Transcendence. *Dublin Rev.*, 1906.
- HUGHES, S.J., THOMAS. Biology, or the Principle of Life. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1881.
- HUGONIN. De materia et forma apud S. Thomam. Paris, 1854.
- HUGENY, E. A quel bonheur sommes-nous destinés? *Rev. Thom.*, 1905-6.
- HUIT, CH. Le Platonisme au moyen âge. *Ann. Philos. chr.*, 1889.
 Les Arabes et l'aristotélisme. *Ann. Philos. chr.*, 1889.
 La philosophie du moyen âge. *Enseignement chr.*, 1900.
 La philosophie de la nature chez les anciens. Paris, 1901.
- D'HULST, MAURICE. Mélanges philosophiques. Paris, 1892.
- HUMPHREY, S.J., WILLIAM. Conscience and Law or Principles of Human Conduct. 2d ed., London and New York, 1903.
- HUNNAEUS, J. D. Thomæ Aquinatis totius Summæ Theologiæ conclusiones. N. ed., Paris, Roger & Chernoviz, 1890.
- HURTER, S.J., H. Patrum Sanctorum opuscula selecta ad usum præsertim studiosorum theologiæ, Commentariis aucta. Geniponti, 1868.
 Los derechos de la razón y de la fé. Traducción del original alemán por D. J. M. Ortí y Lara. Aguascalientes, 1894.
- HUTTLER, M. Die Religionsphilosophie des Raym. von Sabunde. Augsburg, 1851.
- HUYS, J. La notion de substance dans la philosophie contemporaine et dans la philosophie scolastique. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1898.
- IBN GEHIROL (AVEN-CEBROL). La fuente de la vida. Traducida en el siglo XII. por Juan Hispano Domingo Gonzalez del árabe al latín y ahora por la vez al castellano por F. de Castro y Fernández. Madrid, Serra, 1901.
- ILGNER, C. Die wirtschaftlichen Anschauungen Antonius von Florenz (1389-1459). Paderborn, Schöning, 1904.
- ILLIGENS, EBERHARD. Die unendliche Menge. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1889-90.
- ISENKRAHE, C. TH. Idealismus oder Realismus? Leipzig, 1883.
 Die Objectivität und die Sicherheit des Erkennens. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1893.
 Der Begriff der Zeit. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1902-3.
- ITURRIA, S.J., GREG. Compendium Metaphysicæ eximii Doctoris Francisci Suarez S.J. Madrid, Fontanet, 1901.
- JACCOUD. Elementa philosophiæ theoreticæ et practicæ. Friburgi, 1892.
- JACQUIN, O.P., M. Le néo-platonisme de Jean Scot. *Rev. Sci. Philos. et Théol.*, 1907.

- DE JAEGER, E. *Institutiones philosophicae*. Rollarii, 1900.
- JAHNEL. De conscientiae notione, qualis fuerit apud veteres et apud Christianos usque ad medii aevi exitum. Berol., 1862.
- JAHNKE. Ueber d. ontolog. Beweis von Dasein Gottes, mit besondere Berücksichtigung von Anselm und Descartes. Stralsund, 1874.
- JANAUSCHEK, LEOP. *Bibliographia Bernardina*, qua sancti Bernardi, primi abbatis Claravallensis, operum cum omnium tum singulorum editiones ac versiones vitas et tractatus de eo scriptos quotquot usque ad finem MDCCCXC. Wien, Holder, 1893.
- JANSEN, C.S.S.R., J. L. De criterio veritatis. *Div. Thom.*, 1897.
 Disputatio critica de distinctione virtuali inter essentiam et existentiam. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1898.
 Geschichte und Kritik im Dienste der "Minus probabilis." Paderborn, 1906.
- JANSEN, JORDANUS. Der hl. Thomas von Aquin. Kevelaer, 1898.
- JANSSENS, E. Le néo-criticisme de Charles Renouvier. Théorie de la connaissance et de la certitude. Louvain, 1904.
 La philosophie et l'apologétique de Pascal. Louvain, 1906.
- JANSSENS, LAURENTIUS. Praelectiones de Deo uno, quas ad modum commentarii in Summam Theologicam Divi Aquinatis habebat in collegio S. Anselmi de urbe. Romae, Descelee, 1899.
- JANVIER, O.P. L'action intellectuelle et politique de Léon XIII. Paris, Lecoivre, 1902.
- JARACZEWSKY, AD. Die Ethik des Maimonides und ihr Einfluss auf die scholastische Philosophie des 13. Jahrh. *Zeitsch. f. Philos. u. philos. Kritik*, 1865.
- JASPER. Leibniz und die Scholastik. Leipzig, 1898.
- JAVARY. Guilielmi Alverni episcopi Parisiensis psychologica doctrina. Aureliae, 1851.
- JEILER, O.M., IGNATIUS. S. Bonaventurae principia de concursu Dei generali ad actiones causarum secundarum collecta et S. Thomae doctrina confirmata. Ad Claras Aquas. 1897.
- JELLINEK, M. Thomas von Aquino in der jüdischen Literatur. Leipzig, 1853.
- JOEL, M. Die Religionsphilosophie des Moses b. Maimon. Breslau, 1859.
 Das Verhältniss Alberts des Grossen zu Moses Maimonides. Breslau, 1863.
- JOHNSON, R. M. Roger Bacon, a Martyr to Science. *Cath. World*, xlvii.
- JOVIN, S.J., LOUIS. Praelectiones de Jure Naturali habitae in Collegio S. Joan. Fordh. 1860-61.
 Elementa Philosophiae Moralis. Ambiani, Lambert-Caron, 1865; ed. 4., Neo Eboraci, Benziger, 1886.
 Compendium logicae et metaphysicae. Neo Eboraci, 1869; ed. 6., 1897.

- JOUIN, S.J., LOUIS. The Study of Philosophy. Lecture delivered before Regents of New York. 1869.
 Logie and Metaphysics. New York.
- JOUBAIN, CHARLES. La philosophie de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Paris, Hachette, 1858.
- JUDGE, THOMAS E. The Alphabet of the History of Philosophy. *Rev. Cath. Ped.*, 1903.
 The Nature of the Soul. A Study in Elementary Psychology. *Rev. Cath. Ped.*, 1903.
- JUNDT. Histoire du panthéisme au moyen âge. Paris, 1875.
- JUNGMANN, S.J., JOSEPH. Aesthetik. Freiburg, Herder, 1884; 3. ed., 1866.
- KACHNIK, JOS. Dissertatio philosophica, quam usibus Theologiae studiosorum conceinnavit. Olmütz, 1892.
 De natura entis. Olmütz, 1892.
 Historia philosophiae. Olmütz, 1896.
- KÁDÁR, A. A valódi természetbölcselet szelleme. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1887.
- KADERAVEK, EUGEN. Die menschliche Seele an sich betrachtet. 1883.
 Vergleichung der christ. Philosophie mit einigen Philosophien der Neuzeit. 1885.
 Das Urtheil. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1890.
 Ueber die Einführung der christlichen oder aristotelischthomistischen Philosophie an den philosophischen Facultäten. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1890.
 Psychologie. 1894.
- KAISER, EMILE. Pierre Abélard critique. Fribourg-en-Suisse, 1901.
- KAMPMANN. Philosophia angelico-seraphica. Quaracchi, 1896.
- KANTOROWICZ, H. Albertus Gandinus und das Strafrecht der Scholastik. Berlin, Guttentag, 1907 ff.
- KÁRMÁN, P. Anyag és szellem. Budapest, 1894.
- KAUFMANN, DAVID. Studien über Salomon Ibn Gabirol. Budapest, 1899.
- KAUFMANN, NIKOLAUS. Vervollkommnung der aristotelischen Naturphilosophie. Lucern, 1883.
 Bedeutung eines philosophischen Principes: Der Akt ist früher als die Potenz. Lucern, 1886.
 Die Erkenntnisslehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin und ihre Bedeutung in der Gegenwart. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1889.
 Bedeutung der Philosophie in der Gegenwart. Frankfurt-a-M., 1889.
 Das Causalitätsprincip und seine Bedeutung für die Philosophie. Fulda, Actiendruckerei, 1891.
 Die teleologische Naturauffassung des Aristoteles und ihre Bedeutung in der Gegenwart. Paderborn, 2. ed., 1893.
 Elemente der aristotelischen Ontologie. Mit Berücksichtigung der

- Weiterbildung durch den hl. Thomas v. Aq. und neuere Aristoteliker. Lucern, 1897.
- KAUFMAN, NIKOLAUS. Christliche Moral und moderne atheistische Ethik. Lucern, 1898.
- Die Begründung der Schönheit nach der Lehre des Aristoteles und des Thomas v. Aquino. *Kath. Schw. Bl.*, ii.
- Die Philosophie des hl. Thomas und die Cultur der Neuzeit. *Schw. Kirchenzeitung*, 1901.
- Das Pontificat Leos XIII und der Neuthomismus. *Schw. Kirchenzeitung*, 1902.
- La finalité dans l'ordre moral. Louvain, 1899.
- Philosophie naturelle d'Aristote. Etude de la cause finale et son importance au temps présent (trad. par A. Deiber). Paris, Alcan, 1898.
- KAULICH, WILHELM. Das speculative System des Johannes Scotus Erigena. Prag, 1860.
- Scotus Erigena. *Abhandl. d. böhm. Gesell. d. Wiss.*, 1861.
- Geschichte der scholastischen Philosophie. Prag, 1863.
- Die Lehre des Hugo und Richard von St. Victor. *Abhandl. d. böhm. Gesell. d. Wiss.*, 1863-64; Prag, 1865.
- KAULLA, R. Die Lehre vom gerechten Preis in der Scholastik. Separatdruck aus der *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft*. Tübingen, Laupp, 1904.
- KEARNEY, O.P., L. F. Proofs of the Existence of God drawn from the Metaphysical or Ideal Order. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1891.
- The "A Simultaneo" Proofs of the Existence of God. *Amer. Eccles. Rev.*, 1892.
- What we Owe to the Summa of St. Thomas. *Rosary*, 1893.
- KELLE, J. Ueber Honorius Augustodunensis und das Elucidarium sive Dialogus de summa totius christianae theologiae. Wien, 1901.
- Untersuchungen über das speculum Ecclesiae des Honorius und die Libri deflorationum des Abtes Werner. Wien, 1902.
- Untersuchungen über das Offendiculum des Honorius, sein Verhältniss zu dem gleichfalls einem Honorius zugeschriebenen Eucharistion und Elucidarius sowie zu den deutschen Gedichten Gehugde und Pfaffenleben. Wien, 1904.
- Untersuchungen über des Honorius Inevitabile sive de Praedestinatione et libero arbitrio dialogus. Wien, 1905.
- Untersuchungen über den nicht nachweisbaren Honorius Augustodunensis ecclesiae presbiter et scholasticus und die ihm zugeschriebenen Werke. Wien, 1905.
- Untersuchungen über den nicht nachweisbaren Honorius Augustodunensis. Nachtrag. Wien, 1906.
- KENT, O.S.C., W. H. Theology and Modern Thought. *Dublin Rev.*, 1900.
- Hegel and the Schoolmen. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1903.
- St. Thomas and the Arab Neo-Platonists. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1904.

- KFULLER, J. M. L. Saint Thomas. *De Katholick*, 1897.
- KILGENSTEIN, JAKOB. Die Gotteslehre des Hugo von St. Victor nebst einer einleitenden Untersuchung über Hugo's Leben und seine hervorragenden Werke. Würzburg, 1898.
- KISS, J. XIII Leo körlevele a keresztény szellemű böleselet visszaállítására érdekében. *Böles. Foly.*, 1886.
- A szervetlen testek lényegéről. *Böles. Foly.*, 1887.
- Rövid tájékoztató a scholasticus böleseletről. *Böles. Foly.*, 1891.
- A lény fogalmáról. *Böles. Foly.*, 1892.
- A lény fölveiről. *Lényeg és létezés. Böles. Foly.*, 1893.
- Az élettelen és az élő anyag jellegzése. *Böles. Foly.*, 1894.
- A szépről és a szepművészetekről. Budapest, 1904.
- KLEEKAMM, J. Die menschliche Seele, ihre Geistigkeit und Unsterblichkeit. Heiligenstadt, 1897.
- KLEIBER, C. C. L. De Raymundi vita et scriptis. Berolini, 1856.
- KLEUTGEN, S.J., JOSEPH. Institutiones philosophiæ practicæ in usum prælectionum. Friburgi Helvetiorum, 1837.
- Die Philosophie der Vorzeit. Innsbruck, 1860–63; 2. ed., 1878–79; Ital. by Reisch and Curci. Roma, 1866 ff.; French by C. Sierp. Paris, Gaume, 1868–70.
- L'ontologismo e le sette tesi censurate dalla Sacra Inquisizione. Roma, 1867.
- Beilagen zu den Werken über die Theologie und Philosophie der Vorzeit. Erstes Heft: Ueber die Verurtheilung des Ontologismus durch den H. Stuhl. Münster, 1868.
2. Heft: Zu meiner Rechtfertigung. Münster, 1868.
3. Heft: 1. Vom intellectus agens und den angeborenen Ideen.
2. Zur Lehre vom Glauben. Münster, 1875.
- De ipso Deo. Regensburg, Pustet, 1881.
- Ueber den Ursprung der menschlichen Seele. *Zeitsch. f. kath. Theol.*, vii.
- KLIMKE, S.J., FRIEDR. Die Philosophie des Monismus. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1907.
- KNABENHAUER, S.J., J. Das Zeugniß des Menschengeschlechtes für die Unsterblichkeit der Seele. Freiburg, 1888.
- KNAUER, V. Grundlinien zur aristotelisch-thomistischen Psychologie. Wien, 1885.
- KNEIB, PHILIPP. Die Willensfreiheit und die innere Verantwortlichkeit. Mainz. Kirchheim, 1899.
- Die Unsterblichkeit der Seele, bewiesen aus dem höheren Erkennen und Wollen. Ein Beitrag zur Apologetik und zur Würdigung der thomistischen Philosophie. Wien, Mayer, 1900.
- KNOODT, PETER. Die Thomas Encyclica Leos XIII vom 4 August 1879. Vortrag gehalten zu Bonn am 14 Februar 1880. Bonn, 1880.
- KÖGEL, JUL. Petrus Lombardus in seiner Stellung zur Philosophie des Mittelalters. Greifswald, 1897.

- KOMÁRIK, S.J., ST. Idő és örökkévalóság. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1904.
- KOPPEHL, HERM. Die Verwandtschaft Leibnizens mit Thomas von Aquino in der Lehre vom Bösen. Jena, 1892.
- KÖRBER, J. Das ontologische Argument. Bamberg, 1884.
- KOVÁCS LAJOS. A keresztény Hitvédelem ABC-je. Temesvár, 1903.
- KOZÁRY, J. Az inductio és az iskola. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1887.
- A világtani és céltani érv értelme néhány ellenvetés ellen. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1888.
- Korunk böleselete. Pécs, 1892.
- A hypnotizmusról. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1892.
- Wundt rendszerének ismertetése és bírálata. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1897.
- KRAMMER, G. Az állam és az állambatalomról. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1896.
- Isten működése a teremtett világban. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1902.
- KRAUSE, JOS. Bonaventuræ de origine et via cognitionis intellectualis doctrina ab ontologismi nota defensa. Monasterii, 1868.
- Die Lehre des hl. Bonaventura über d. Natur der körperl. u. geistigen Wesen und ihr Verhältniss zum Thomismus. Paderborn, 1888.
- Quomodo S. Bonaventura mundum non esse aeternum, sed tempore ortum demonstraverit. Braunsberg, 1891.
- S. Bonaventuræ in doctrina de rerum naturalium origiue S. Augustinum secutum esse. Braunsberg, 1894.
- KREBS, E. Studien über Meister Dietrich genannt von Freiburg. Freiburg-i-B., 1903.
- Meister Dietrich (Theodoricus Teutonicus de Vriberg). Sein Leben, seine Werke, seine Wissenschaft (Beiträge). Münster, 1906.
- KROGH-TOXNING, K. De gratia Christi et de libero arbitrio Sancti Thomæ Aquinatis doctrina. Christiania, 1898.
- Der letzte Scholastiker. Freiburg, Herder, 1904.
- KRÖNLEIN. Amalrich von Bena und David von Dinant. Hamburg, 1847.
- KRUG, H. De pulchritudine divina libri tres. Friburgi Brisg., Herder, 1902.
- KUHN. Glauben und Wissen nach Thomas von Aquino. *Tüb. theol. Quart.*, 1860.
- Philosophiae und Theologiae. Tübingen, 1860.
- KÜPPERS, W. John Locke und die Scholastik. Bern, Korb, 1895.
- KURTH, GODEFROID. Die Arbeiter. Einigungen des Mittelalters (transl. from the French by A. Leimbach). Fulda, 1894.
- Qu'est-ce que le moyen âge? Bruxelles, 1898.
- LABROSSE, H. Recherches sur la vie et l'œuvre de Nicolas de Lire. Toulouse, Privat, 1906.
- LACOUTURE, S.J., CHARLES. Esthétique fondamentale. Précédé d'une lettre de M. E. Guillaume. Paris, Retaux, 1900.
- LAHOUSSE, S.J., GUSTAVUS. Praelectiones metaphysicae specialis. 4 vol., Louvain, 1888.

- LAHOUSSE, S.J., GUSTAVUS. *Prælectiones logicæ et ontologiæ*. Lovanii, Peeters, 1889.
- Summa philosophica ad mentem Sancti Thomæ. Lovanii, 1892.
- LAMERS, G. H. Thomas van Aquino. Utrecht, 1896.
- LANGEN, JOS. Roger Bacon. *Histor. Zeitsch.*, 1883.
- DE LANTSHEERE, L. Du bien au point de vue ontologique et moral. Louvain, 1886.
- L'objectivité de la connaissance. Bruxelles, 1890.
- LANZILLI, S.J. In Cosmologicis Questionibus Comparatio. Vallibus Anicii, 1861.
- LASPLASAS. Ensayo de una definición de la escolástica. Barcelona, 1903.
- LATINUS, J. Une excursion philosophique en Espagne. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1901.
- LAUER, H. Die Gewissenslehre Alberts des Grossen. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1904.
- LAUNOY. De varia Aristotelis in Academia Parisiensi fortuna. Wittenberg, 1820.
- LAURIE. Lectures on the Rise and Early Constitution of the Universities. London, 1886.
- LECLÈRE, ALBERT. De facultate verum assequendi secundum Balmesium. Paris, 1900.
- Le mouvement catholique kantien en France à l'heure présente. *Kantstudien*, 1902.
- La philosophie au moyen âge. *Arch. Gesch. Philos.*, 1907.
- LECOULTRE, E. La doctrine de Dieu d'après Aristote et saint Thomas d'Aquin. Lausanne, 1877.
- Essai sur la psychologie des actions humaines d'après les systèmes d'Aristote et de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Paris, 1883.
- LECOY DE LA MARCHE, ALBERT. Le treizième siècle littéraire et scientifique. N. ed., Lille, Desclée, 1896.
- LEFEBVRE, E. Logique. Louvain, 1885.
- La bête et l'homme. Louvain, 1886.
- LEFEVRE, G. Les variations de Guillaume de Champeaux et la question des universaux. *Trav. et Mém. de l'Univ. de Lille*, 1898.
- DE LEHEN, S.J., P. E. Institutiones Logicæ ad usum prælectionum accommodatæ et immaculatæ deiparæ dicatæ. Blesis, Giraud, 1860.
- LEHMEN, S.J., ALFONS. Lehrbuch der Philosophie auf aristotelisch-scholastischer Grundlage zum Gebrauche an höheren Lehranstalten und zum Selbstunterricht. Freiburg, Herder, 1899-1906.
- LEHMKEHL, S.J., AUG. Probabilismus vindicatus. Freiburg, Herder, 1906.
- LEIST, O. Der Anticlaudianus: ein lat. Gedicht des 12. Jahrh. und sein Verfasser Almus ab Insulis. Beilage z. Programm des Gymnasiums zu Seehausen i. d. Altm., 1878-82.
- LEMANN, AUGUSTIN. Salomon et saint Thomas d'Aquin. Lyon, Vitte.

- LEMANS, M. Levensbeschrijving van Maimonides. Amsterdam, 1815.
- LEMONS, O.F.M., PLACIDO ANGEL. La vida orgánica en sí misma y en sus manifestaciones. Madrid, Del Amo, 1902.
- LENTZEN, J. H. Erkennen und Glauben, mit besond. Berücksichtigung des Anselms von Canterbury. Bonn, 1848.
- LEO XIII. De Philosophia christiana ad mentem S. Thomæ Aquinatis doctoris angelici in scholis catholicis instauranda. S. D. N. Leonis D. P. Papæ XIII epistola encyclica. Romæ, 1879; Engl. by F. Rawes, London, Burns & Oates, 1879.
- The great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, with Preface by Rev. J. J. Wynne, S.J. New York, Benziger, 1903.
- LEPICIER, A. M. Tractatus de Deo uno. Pars I: De pertinentibus ad divinam essentiam. Paris, Lethielleux, 1902.
- LEPIDI, O.P., ALBERTO. Examen philosophico-theologicum de ontologismo. Lovanii, Fonteyn, 1874.
- Elementa philosophiæ christianæ. Lovanii, Peeters, 1875 ff.
- L'attività volontaria dell'uomo e l'influsso causale di Dio. Roma, Befani, 1890.
- Opuscules philosophiques (trad. franc. par E. Vignon). Paris, 1900.
- LERCHER, S.J., L. Ueber eine Form des Gottesbeweises aus der sittlichen Verpflichtung. *Zeitsch. f. kath. Theol.*, 1900.
- LE ROY, EDOUARD. Scholastique et Philosophie moderne. *Demain* (Lyon), 1906.
- LESSERTEUR, E. C. Saint Thomas et la prédestination. Paris, Lethielleux, 1888.
- LEUGYEL, J. Az emberi és az állati lélekéről. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1892.
- Az életeréről. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1893.
- LÈVAY, P. Aquinas és Decart. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1893.
- LÉVY, L. G. La métaphysique de Maimonide. Dijon, 1905.
- LIBERATORE, S.J., MATTEO. Dialoghi filosofici. Napoli, 1840; 2. ed., 1851.
- Institutiones logicæ et metaphysicæ. Neapoli, 1840-42; Mediolani, 1846.
- Theses ex metaphysica selectæ quas suscipit propugnandas Franciscus Pirenzio in collegio neapolitano S. J. ab. divi Sebastiani Quinto Idus Septembris anno MDCCCXLI. Neapoli, 1842.
- Dialogo sopra l'origine delle idee. Napoli, 1843.
- Il Panteismo transcendente, dialogo. Napoli, 1844.
- Il Progresso. Dialogo filosofico di M. Liberatore. 2. ed., Genova, 1846.
- Ethicæ et juris naturæ elementa. Neapoli, 1846; Romæ, 1857; Ital., Roma, 1863.
- Elementi di filosofia. Napoli, 1848; 2. ed., 1850; Livorno, 1852.
- Institutiones philosophicæ. Neapoli, 1851; 5. ed., Romæ, 1872.
- Della conoscenza intellettuale. Napoli, 1855; Roma, 1857; Germ. by E. Franz, Mainz, 1861; French by E. Sudre, Tournai, 1863.

- LIBERATORE, S.J., MATTEO. *Compendium logicæ et metaphysicæ*. Roma, 1858.
- Sopra la teoria scolastica della composizione sostanziale dei corpi. Roma, 1861.
- Risposta ad una lettera anonima sopra la teoria scolastica della composizione sostanziale dei corpi. Roma, 1861.
- Dell'uomo. V. 1: Del composto umano. V. 2: Dell'anima umana. Roma, 1862 ff.; Span., Barcelona, 1882; French by Deshayes. Paris, Berche & Tralin, 1885.
- La Filosofia della Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri. (In Omaggio a Dante Aligh. dei Cattolici ital.) Roma, 1865.
- Spicilegio del P. M. Liberatore d. C. d. G. Napoli, 1877-78.
- Della composizione sostanziale dei corpi. Napoli, 1878.
- L'autoerazia dell'ente. *Commedia in tre atti*. Napoli, 1880.
- Degli universali. Confutazione della filosofia Rosminiana difesa da Mons. Ferre. Roma, 1883-4; Span. by F. de P. Ribas y Servet, Barcelona, 1888; Engl. by E. H. Dering, London, 1889.
- LIEBNER, A. Hugo von St. Victor und die theologischen Richtungen seiner Zeit. Leipzig, 1836.
- DE LIECHTY, R. Albert le Grand et saint Thomas d'Aquin, ou la science au moyen âge. Paris, 1880.
- Les Questions disputées, traité de l'être et de l'essence. Bar-le-Duc, 1883.
- LIEDTKE, H. Die Beweise fürs Daseins Gottes bei Anselm v. C. und Renatus Descartes. Heidelberg, 1893.
- LILLA, VINCENZO. La mente dell'Aquinate e la filosofia moderna. Torino, 1873.
- S. Tommaso d'Aquino filosofo in relazione con Aristotele e Platone. Napoli, 1880.
- LIMBOURG, S.J., MAX. De distinctione essentie ab existentia. Regensburg, 1883.
- Die Prädestinationslehre des hl. Bonaventura. *Zeit. f. kath. Theol.*, 1892.
- Die Analogie des Seinbegriffes. *Zeitsch. f. kath. Theol.*, 1893.
- Questionum metaphysicarum libri V. *Innsbruck*, 1893.
- LINDSAY. Scholastic and Mediæval Philosophy. *Arch. Gesch. Philos.*, 1902.
- LIPPARONI, GREG. A philosophia conforme a mente de S. Thomas de Aquino, exposta per A. Rosmini. Rio de Janeiro, 1880.
- LIPPERHEIDE, VICTOR. Thomas von Aquino und die platonische Ideenlehre. München, 1890.
- LITTLE, A. G. Grey Friars of Oxford. Oxford, 1892.
- LOEV. De vita R. Lulli specimen. Halle, 1830.
- LOEWE. Der Kampf zwischen dem Realismus und Nominalismus im Mittelalter, sein Ursprung, und sein Verlauf. Prag, 1876.
- LORENTZ, F. Alenins Leben. Halle, 1829; Engl. by J. M. Slee, London, 1837.

- LORENZELLI, BENEDETTO. *Philosophie theoretiæ institutiones secundum doctrinam Aristotelis et S. Thomæ Aquinatis*. Rome, 1890; n. ed., 1896.
- LOTTIN, J. *La Statistique morale et le Déterminisme*. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1908.
- LOTTINI, O.P., JOANNES. *Compendium philosophiæ scholasticæ ad mentem S. Thomæ Aquinatis*. Firenze, 1900.
- LOUAGE, C.S.C., A. *A Course of Philosophy*. Embracing Logic, Metaphysics and Ethics. 2. ed., Baltimore, 1883.
- LÖWENTHAL, ALB. Dominicus Gundisalvi und sein psychologisches Compendium. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der philosophischen Literatur bei Arabern, Juden und Christen. Berlin, 1890.
- Pseudo-Aristoteles über die Seele: eine psychologische Schrift des XI. Jahrhunderts und ihre Beziehung zu S. ibn Gabirol. Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1891.
- LOZADA, NICANOR. *Filosofía católica*. Apuntés de lógica, cosmología y psicología, para los alumnos del Seminario Conciliar. México, 1880.
- LOZANO Y RUBIO, T. *Las armas de dialéctica, o breve instrucción para los actos escolásticos en cátedras y academias*. Apéndice sobre las leyes del silogismo. Madrid, 1894.
- LUBRICH, A. *Termeszet böleselet*. Budapest, 1890.
- Neveléstudomány és a böleselet. Budapest, 1891.
- LUDEWIG, S.J., KARL. *Die Substanztheorie bei Cartesius im Zusammenhang mit der scholastischen u. neueren Philosophie*. Fulda, 1893.
- LULL, RAMÓN. *Obras de Ramon Lull*. *Libre del gentil e los tres savis*: libre de la primera e segona intenció; libre de mil proverbis. Textos originales publicados e ilustrados con notas y variantes por J. Roselló. Prologo y glosario de M. Obrador y Bennassar. Palma de Mallorca, Colomar, 1886-1901.
- LUQUET, G. H. *Aristote et l'Université de Paris pendant le XIII. siècle*. Paris, Leroux, 1904.
- LYONS. *La Somme de saint Thomas d'Aquin résumée en tableaux synoptiques*. Nice, 1901.
- MCCABE, JOS. *Peter Abelard*. London, Duckworth, 1901.
- MACDONALD, ALEX. *Evolution and the Fathers*. *The Casket* (Antigonish), 1895.
- St. Thomas and Evolution. *Casket*, 1896.
- Development not Evolution. *Cath. World*, 1896.
- St. Thomas on the Memory. *Eccles. Rev.*, 1902.
- Bridging the Grave. *Eccles. Rev.*, 1902.
- The Psychology of our Spiritual Conceptions. *Dolphin*, 1905; *Eccles. Rev.*, 1906.
- St. Thomas and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1906.

- MACDONALD, ALEX. *St. Thomas and the Virgin Birth. Questions of the Day*, Vol. 1, C. P. A. Pub. Co., New York.
- The Ethical Aspect of Bribery. *Questions of the Day*, Vol. 2; C. P. A. Pub. Co., New York.
- The Imagination. *Questions of the Day*, Vol. 2; C. P. A. Pub. Co., New York.
- MCDONALD, WALTER. The Conservation of Energy and the Vital Activity of Organisms. *Dublin Rev.*, 1902.
- The New Knowledge and the Old Philosophy. *New York Rev.*, 1905.
- MENABO, O.P., VINCENT. Logic and Faith. *New York Rev.*, 1905-6.
- Scholasticism and the Modern Method. *Amer. Eccles. Rev.*, 1903.
- MCSORLEY, C.S.P., JOSEPH. The Christian Idea of Justice and Equality. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1898.
- Hugo of Saint-Victor, Mystic. *Dolphin*, 1902.
- MADER, D. *Oratio de laudibus Thomæ Aq.* Pragæ, 1870.
- DE MADUREIRA, B. A. Compendio de philosophia elemental conforme ao programma official de 1895. Coimbra, 1896.
- MAGEVNEY, S.J., EUGENE. Christian Education in the "Dark Ages." *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1898.
- MAHER, S.J., MICHAEL. Psychology. New York, Benziger, 1891; 5. ed., London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1902.
- MAIMONIDES. *Perusch Ma-Mischna*. German by R. I. Fürstenthal. Breslau, 1842.
- Yad Hachazakah or Mischne Torah. Hebrew and Engl. by H. H. Bernard, Cambridge, 1832; Hebr. and Germ. by E. Mahler, Wien, 1889; Germ. by E. Soloweiczky, Königsberg, 1846; Engl., London, 1838; n. ed., 1863.
- More nebuchim (Guide of the perplexed). Arab and French by S. Munk, Paris, 1855-56; Hebr. and Germ. by S. Scheyer, Frankfurt, 1830-38; Germ. by R. J. Fürstenthal, Krotoschin, 1838; Ital. by D. I. Maroni, Livorno, 1870-71; Engl. by M. Friedländer, London, 1885.
- Kiddusch Hachodesch. Uebersetzt und erläutert v. E. Mahler. Wien, 1899.
- MAISONNEUVE, L. Un cardinal philosophe. Mgr. Mercier. *Bu. l. eccl.*, 1907.
- MAMINI, C. Intorno al libro del Prof. C. Passaglia intitolato "La dottrina di San Tommaso secondo l'enciclica di Leone XIII." Torino, 1881.
- MANCINI, HIERONYMO MARIA. Elementa philosophiæ ad mentem D. Thomæ Aquinatis ad triennium accommodata. Romæ. Propaganda, 1898.
- DE MANDATO, S.J., PIUS. Institutiones philosophicæ ad normam doctrine Aristotelis et S. Thomæ. Romæ, 1894.
- Le specie organiche secondo la dottrina di San Tommaso e la moderna teoria degli evoluzionisti. Roma, Befani, 1895.

- DE MANDATO, S.J., PIUS. Dissertazioni filosofiche. Esistenza di Dio, Teosofismo moderno, Evoluzionismo, Cause e rimedi di materialismo, Importanza della religione. Roma, 1907.
- MANDONNET, O.P., PIERRE. Les idées cosinographiques d'Albert le Grand et la déconverte de l'Amérique. *Rev. thom.*, 1893.
- Polémique averroïste de Siger de Brabant et saint Thomas. *Rev. thom.*, 1895-96.
- Jean Scot Erigène et Jean le Sourd. *Rev. thom.*, 1897.
- Siger de Brabant et l'Averroïsme latin au XIII. siècle. Fribourg, 1899.
- Le Traité "De Erroribus Philosophorum." *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1907.
- MANO, C. Le problème de la vie ou le principe vital devant la science et la métaphysique. Paris, Bloud, 1900.
- Le Pessimisme contemporain. Ses précurseurs, ses représentants, ses sources. Paris, Bloud, 1902.
- MANSEY, J. A. Possibilitas præmotionis physice thomistice in actibus liberis naturalibus juxta mentem divi Aquinatis. Friburgi (Switz.), 1895.
- MANSION, A. L'induction chez Albert le Grand. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1906.
- DE MARGERIE, A. Essai sur la philosophie de saint Bonaventure. Paris, 1855.
- Le principe de causalité est-il une proposition analytique ou une proposition synthétique a priori? *Ann. Philos. chr.*, 1888.
- DE MARIA, S.J., MICHAEL. Opuscula philosophica et theologica Sti. Thomæ Aq. Editio accurate recognita et nonnullis quæstionibus ac scholiis aucta. Tiferni Tiberini, Città di Castello, 1886.
- Philosophia peripatetico-scholastica. 3 vol., Romæ, 1892.
- Compendium logica et metaphysicæ. Romæ, Cuggiani, 1897; ed. 2., 1900.
- MARIANI, A. San Bonaventura . . . studii. Firenze, 1874.
- MARIÉTAN, J. Problème de la classification des sciences d'Aristote à saint Thomas. Paris, 1901.
- MARIOTTI, C. San Francesco, San Tommaso e Dante nella civiltà cristiana. Venezia, 1883.
- MARKE, D. Die natürliche Theologie des Raymundus von Sabunde. 1846.
- MARTANI, L. Osservazioni preliminari allo studio della filosofia tomistica. Piacenza, 1889.
- MARTÍ DE EIXALA, RAMÓN. Curso de Filosofía elemental. Barcelona, 1841.
- Manual de la historia de la filosofía. Barcelona, 1842.
- DE MARTIGNÉ, PROSPER. La Scolastique et les traditions franciscaines. Paris, Lethielleux, 1888.
- MARTIN, A. Suarez métaphysicien commentateur de saint Thomas. *Sc. cath.*, 1898.

- MARTIN, P. A szépség fogalmáról. *Böles. Foly.*, 1886.
Szent Tamás és Kant. *Böles. Foly.*, 1887.
- MARTINEZ, MARCELINO. Fray Luis de León y la filosofía española del siglo XVI. Madrid, 1891.
- MARTINEZ NUÑEZ, ZACARÍAS. Ideas, Imágenes y Sensaciones. *Ciudad de Dios*, 1907.
Estudios biológicos. Madrid, Saenz de Jubera, 1907.
- DE MATTIA, G. La mente di San Tommaso intorno all'origine dell'anima, sua unione col corpo ed origine delle idee. Napoli, Errico, 1900.
- MATTHUSSI, GUIDO. Primato della volontà. *Scuola catt.*, 1906.
Ancora la volontà nel pensiero del Venerabile Duns Scoto. *Scuola catt.*, 1906.
- MAUMUS, O.P., V. Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la philosophie cartésienne. Paris, Lecoffre, 1890.
Les Philosophes contemporains. Paris, Lecoffre, 1891.
Les doctrines politiques de saint Thomas d'Aquin. *Rer. Thom.*, 1893.
- MAURA, JUAN. Importancia de la restauración de la filosofía escolástica en estos tiempos. Alicante, Seva, 1890.
- MAURA Y GELABERT. El optimismo del B. Raimundo Lulio. Barcelona, 1904.
- MAURENBRECHER, MAX. Thomas von Aquino's Stellung zum Wirthschaftsleben seiner Zeit. Leipzig, 1898.
- MAURO, S.J., SYLVESTRO. Quaestiones Philosophicae auctore S. Mauro S. J. presbytero, olim in Collegio Romano Philosophiae et S. Theologiae Professore, ed. novissima cum epistola a R. P. M. Liberatore praefata. Parisiis, Lecoffre, 1876.
- MAUSEBACH, JOS. Christenthum und Weltmoral. 2 Vorträge über das Verhältniss der christlichen Moral zur antiken Ethik und zur weltlichen Cultur. Münster, Aschendorff, 1897.
Der Begriff des sittlich Guten nach d. hl. Thomas von Aquino. Freiburg, 1898.
Divi Thomae Aquinatis de voluntate et appetitu sensitivo doctrina. Paderborn, 1901.
Die katholische Moral, ihre Methoden, Grundsätze und Aufgaben. Köln, 1901.
Die Stellung des hl. Thomas von Aquin zu Maimonides in der Lehre von der Prophetie. *Theol. Quart.*, lxxxi.
- MAXWELL, H. Roger Bacon. *Blackwood's Mag.*, clvi.
- MAZELLA, S.J., CAMILLUS. De Deo Creante. Praelectiones Scholastico-Dogmaticae quas in Collegio SS. Cordis Jesu ad Woodstock maxima studiorum Domo Soc. Jesu in Foed. Americae Sept. Statibus habebat. Woodstock, 1877; ed. 3., Romae, 1893.
- MEDICUS, FRITZ. Ein Wortführer der Neuscholastik und seine Kant-kritik. *Kantstudien*, 1901.

- MEHREN, A. F. M. La philosophie d'Avicenne Ibn Sina, exposée d'après des documents inédits. Louvain, 1882.
- Les rapports de la philosophie d'Avicenne avec l'Islam. Louvain, 1883.
- Etudes sur la philosophie d'Avicenne concernant son rapport avec celle d'Avicenne et Gazzali. Louvain, 1888.
- MEIER, H. Kausalität und Identität. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1907.
- MENDIVE, S. J., J. Curso completo de filosofía. Madrid, 1886.
- Institutiones philosophiæ scholasticæ ad mentem Divi Thomæ ac Suarezii. Vallisoleti, Cuesta, 1886-88.
- La religion católica vindicada de las imposturas racionalistas (con un prólogo de D. J. M. Ortí y Lara). Madrid, 1883.
- MENECHINI. Del vero, del buono e del bello. Napoli, 1879.
- MENZEL. Doctrina J. Scoti Erigenæ cum christiana comparata. Bautzen, 1869.
- MERICHI, M. Utrum in dialectica aristotelica recte distinguantur figuræ modique syllogismi. Freiburg-i-S., imp. S. Paul, 1898.
- MERCIER, DÉSIRÉ. Discours d'ouverture du cours de philosophie de saint Thomas. Louvain, 1882.
- Le déterminisme mécanique et le libre arbitre. Louvain, 1884.
- Sommaire du cours de philosophie selon saint Thomas d'Aquin, professé à l'Univ. de Louvain. Théodicée, 1884; Cosmologie, 1887; Morale générale, 1890; Notions d'Ontologie, 1890.
- Leçons d'ouverture de l'école supérieure de philosophie à l'Univ. de Louvain. Lille, 1890.
- Les deux critiques de Kant. Paris, 1891.
- Rapport sur les études supérieures de philosophie. Louvain, 1891; Span., Lima, imp. de "El Obrero," 1902.
- La philosophie néo-scholastique. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1894.
- Les origines de la psychologie contemporaine. Louvain, 1897; Polish by W. Kosiakiewiczza, Warszawa, 1900; Span. by Arnaiz, Madrid, Saenz de Jubera, 1901; Ital. by A. Messina, Roma, Deselec, 1903.
- Discussion de la théorie des trois vérités primitives. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1897.
- La définition philosophique de la vie. 2. ed., Louvain, 1898.
- La psychologie de Descartes et l'anthropologie scolastique. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1898.
- "Ecco l'alarme"—Un cri d'alarme. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1899.
- Critériologie générale ou traité général de la certitude. Louvain, 1899; 5. ed., 1906; Polish by W. Kosiakiewiczza and A. Krasnowolskiego, Warszawa, 1901; Portug. by Dantas Pereira, Vizeu, 1904.
- La notion de la vérité. Louvain, 1900.
- La psychologie expérimentale et la philosophie spiritualiste. Louvain, 1900; Engl. by E. J. Wirth, New York, Benziger, 1902.

- MERCIER, DÉSIRÉ. La pensée et la loi de la conservation de l'énergie. Louvain, 1900.
- Le bilan philosophique du XIX. siècle. Louvain, 1900.
- MERTEN, J. Ueber die Bedeutung der Erkenntnißlehre des hl. Augustinus und des hl. Thomas von Aquino für den geschichtlichen Entwicklungsgang der Philosophie als reiner Vernunftwissenschaft. Trier, 1865.
- MEUFFELS, HUBERT. A propos d'un mot nouveau. *Quinzaine*, 1901.
- Un problème à résoudre: dans quelle langue doit être donné l'enseignement de la philosophie dans les séminaires. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1902.
- MEURIN, S.J., LEO. Ethics. Port-Louis, 1891.
- MEYER, S.J., THEOD. Institutiones juris naturalis seu philosophia moralis secundum principia S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Friburgi, Herder, 1885 ff.
- MEYNELL, CHARLES. Padre Liberatore and the Ontologists. London, 1868.
- MEZARD, O.P., P. Medulla S. Thomæ Aquinatis seu meditationes ex operibus S. Thomæ depromptæ. Paris, Lethielleux, 1907.
- MEZZERA, GIUS. Risposta al libro del G. M. Cornoldi "Il Rosminianismo." Milano, 1883.
- MICHAEL, S.J., E. Albert der Grosse. *Zeitsch. f. kath. Theol.*, 1901.
- Geschichte des deutschen Volkes vom 13. Jahrh. bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters. Freiburg, Herder, 1903 ff.
- MICHAUD. Guillaume de Champeaux. Paris, 1867.
- MICHEL, ANTON. Die Kosmologie des Mos. Maimonides und des Thomas von Aquino in ihren gegenseitigen Beziehungen. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1891-92.
- MICHELIS, FRIED. Bemerkungen zu der von J. Kleutgen vertheidigten Philosophie der Vorzeit. Freiburg, Herder, 1861.
- MICHELITSCH, A. Atomismus, Hylemorphismus und Naturwissenschaft. Graz, 1897.
- MIELLE, P. De substantiæ corporalis vi et ratione secundum Aristotelis doctorumque scholasticorum sententiam. Lingonis, 1894.
- La Matière première et l'étendue. Fribourg, 1898.
- Les postulats de l'idéalisme et la théorie de la connaissance. *Pensée contemp.*, 1907.
- MIGNE. Patrologia latina. 221 vol. in-4o, Paris, 1844-55.
- MIGNON, A. Les origines de la scolastique et Hugues de Saint-Victor. Paris, Lethielleux, 1895.
- MIHÁLKOVICS, E. Ismerettani előadások. *Böles. Foly.*, 1893.
- MIHÁLOVITS, E. Plátó theológiája. *Böles. Foly.*, 1893.
- Az indukció határai. *Böles. Foly.*, 1898.
- MIHÁLYFY, A. Az állambírálatom eredete. *Böles. Foly.*, 1898.
- MILLER, J. BLEECKER. Leo XIII and Modern Civilization. New York, Ekdale Press, 1897.

- MILLION, F. La clef de la Philosophie scolastique. Etude sur la composition substantielle des corps d'après saint Thomas d'Aquin. Paris, Delhomme & Brigue, 1897.
- MING, S.J., JOHN J. Modern and Ancient Philosophy Compared. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1879.
- Pretended Unity of Modern Philosophy. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1880.
- The Existence of God Demonstrated. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1881-82.
- On the Nature of the Human Soul. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1884.
- Science and Speculative Philosophy. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1887.
- The Idea of Evolution. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1893.
- Criticism on Recent Pantheistic Evolution. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1894.
- The Data of Modern Ethics Examined. 3d ed., New York, Benziger, 1894.
- Modern Theories of Society. The End of Society. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1896.
- Determinism versus Free-Will. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1902.
- MINGES, O.F.M., PARTHENIUS. Ist Duns Scotus Indeterminist? (Beiträge.) Münster, 1905.
- Bedeutung von Objekt, Umständen und Zweck für die Sittlichkeit eines Aktes nach Duns Scotus. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1906.
- Die Gnadenlehre des Duns Scotus auf ihren angeblichen Pelagianismus und Semipelagianismus geprüft. Münster, 1906.
- Der Gottesbegriff des Duns Scotus auf seinen angeblich excessiven Indeterminismus geprüft. Wien, 1906.
- Beitrag zur Lehre des Duns Scotus über die Univokation des Seinsbegriffes. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1907.
- MINTEGUAJA, S.J., V. M. La Moral independiente y los principios del derecho nuevo. 3. ed., Madrid, Del Amo, 1906.
- MIOLA, A. Codices MSS. operum S. Thomae de Aquino et S. Bonaventurae in Regia Neapolitana Bibliotheca, Neapel, 1874.
- MIR, MIGUEL. Armonía entre la ciencia y la fé. N. ed., Madrid, 1892.
- MIRALLES Y SBERT, JOSÉ. Santo Tomas de Aquino y el moderno régimen constitucional. Con un prólogo de D. J. M. Ortí y Lara. Madrid, 1890.
- MISCHEL, WOLF. Die Erkenntnistheorie Maimonides. Berlin, 1903.
- MISSAGLIA, ALOYSIUS. Summula doctrinae Divi Thomae Aquinatis. Milano, 1899; 2. ed., Roma, Desclée, 1900.
- MOGLIA, AGOST. I Suareziani e l'Abate Rosmini. Piacenza, 1885.
- La filosofia di San Tommaso d'Aquino nelle scuole italiane. Piacenza, 1885.
- MOISANT, X. L'existence d'un Dieu personnel. *Etudes*, 1907.
- MÖLLER, NIC. Joh. Scotus Erigena und seine Irrthümer. Mainz, 1844.
- MOLSDORF, WILHELM. Die Idee des Schönen in der Weltgestaltung bei Thomas von Aquino. Jena, 1891.

- MONNIER, FRANCIS. De Gottescalei et Joh. Scoti Erigenae controversia. Paris, 1852.
- Aleuin et son influence littéraire, religieuse et politique chez les Francs. Paris, 1853.
- MONNIER, M. La théorie de la pluralité des formes et la chimie moderne. *Études française.*, 1901.
- MONTAGNANI. Un eminente scolastico troppo dimenticato (Dionisio Certosino). Montrenil-s-Mer, 1898.
- Rosmini, San Tommaso e la Logica. Bologna, 1890.
- Tomisti e Neotomisti. Lettere filosofiche. Roma, Befani, 1891.
- Scolastica ed estetica. Parma, Fiacadori, 1891.
- MONTAGNE, O.P., A. Saint Thomas d'Aquin à Toulouse. *Rev. thom.*, 1894.
- La pensée de saint Thomas sur les formes de gouvernement. *Rev. thom.*, 1900-1.
- DE MONTALEMBERT, C. F. Saint Anselme. Paris, 1844.
- MONTET, LEON. Mémoire sur saint Thomas d'Aquin. Paris, 1847.
- De Principiis quibus constat Thomae Aquinatis Ethica Commendatio. Parisiis, 1848.
- MOOSHERR, K. Die Versöhnungslehre des Anselm von Canterbury und Thomas von Aquino. *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1890.
- DE LA MORA, MIGUEL M. El hombre no pertenece al género animal. Guadalajara, 1904.
- VON MORGOTT, FRANZ P. Die Theorie der Gefühle im Systeme des hl. Thomas. Eichstadt, 1864.
- MORIN, F. De l'histoire de la philosophie scolastique. Lyon, 1852.
- Dictionnaire de philosophie et de théologie scolastique. 2 vol., Paris, 1857-58.
- MOYNIHAN, HUMPHREY. First Principles of Mental Development. *Rev. Cath. Pedag.*, 1903.
- MUCKERMAN, S.J., H. Instinctive and Intelligent Activity. *Messenger*, 1905.
- MÜLLER, ALOYSIUS. Zur Analysis des Raumes. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1903.
- MÜLLER, J. Biographisches über Duns Scotus. Köln, 1881.
- MÜLLER, S.J., J. Der Gottesbeweis aus der Bewegung. *Zeitsch. f. kath. Theol.*, 1897.
- MÜLLER, St. Thomas und die moderne Wissenschaft. Beiträge zum allgemeinen Zeitung. München, 1894.
- MUNGUÍA, C. DE J. Del Culto considerado en sí mismo y en sus relaciones con el individuo, la sociedad y el gobierno. Morelia, 1847.
- Del Derecho natural en sus principios comunes y en sus diversas ramificaciones. 4 vol., México, 1849.
- Obras diversas del licenciado C. de J. Munguía. Morelia, 1852.
- Los Principios de la Iglesia católica comparados con los de las escuelas racionalistas. México, 1878.

- MUNK, SALOMON. Mélanges de philosophie juive et arabe. Paris, 1859.
- DE MUNNYNCK, O.P. Notes sur l'atomisme et l'hylémorphisme. Fribourg, 1898.
- La conservation de l'énergie et la liberté morale. *Rev. Thom.*, 1899; Paris, Bloud, 1901.
- Encore la conservation de l'énergie. *Rev. Thom.*, 1899.
- La prémotion physique selon l'école dominicaine. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1901.
- Prælectiones de Dei existentia. Louvain, 1904.
- MÜNZ, ISAK. Die Religionsphilosophie des Maimonides und ihr Einfluss. Berlin, 1887.
- MURGUE, A. Questions d'ontologie: études sur saint Thomas. Lyon, 1876.
- MYLIUS, G. Scotus Erigena. Halle, 1843.
- NADDEO, P. Il pensiero filosofico moderno e il rinnovamento della filosofia tomistica. Napoli, 1901.
- NAGY, ALBINO. Die philosophischen Abhandlungen des Jaqub ben Ishaq al-Kindi (Beiträge). Münster, 1897.
- DE NARDI, PIETRO. Antonio Rosmini ed i Gesuiti dinanzi a San Tommaso d'Aquino. Torino, 1882.
- I nuovi Tomisti e la storia della filosofia. *Riv. ital. di filos.*, 1890.
- Tommaso d'Aquino e l'età in cui s'avvenne. Forlì, Mariani, 1898.
- NARDINI, O.P., VINCENZO. Manca di verità e si oppone a San Tommaso la soluzione di un alto problema metafisico abbracciata dal Prof. P. M. Liberatore d. C. d. G. Giudizio del P. V. Nardini Domenicano. Roma, 1862.
- NAVILLE, E. Etude sur l'œuvre de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Paris, 1859.
- NEANDER, J. A. W. Der hl. Bernard und sein Zeitalter. Berlin, 1830; French by T. Vial. Paris, 1842; Engl. by M. Wrench, London, 1843.
- NEUMAYR, E. Theorie des Strebens nach Thomas. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Psychologie. Leipzig, 1890.
- NEVEU. De concursu divino juxta S. Thomam, Bannez et Molina. *Dir. Thom.*, 1902.
- NIGLIS, A. Siger von Courtrai. Beiträge zu seiner Würdigung. Freiburg-i-B., Charitas-Druckerei, 1903.
- NITZSCH, F. Quaestiones raimundanae. *Nieder's Zeitsch. f. hist. Theol.*, 1859.
- NOACK, L. Ueber Leben und Schriften des Joh. Scotus Erigena: die Wissenschaft und Bildung seiner Zeit. Leipzig, 1876.
- NOMLE, H. D. La nature de l'émotion selon les modernes et selon saint Thomas. *Rev. sci. phi. et théol.*, 1908.
- NOËL, L. La conscience de l'acte libre et les objections de M. Fouillée. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1899.
- La conscience du libre arbitre. Louvain, 1899.
- Le déterminisme. Louvain, 1905.

- NOLENS, W. H. De Leer van den h. Thomas van Aquino over het recht. Utrecht, Beijers, 1890.
- NORIEGA, RAFAEL. La Escolástica y el pensamiento moderno. *El País* (Mexico), 1903.
- VON NOSTITZ-RIENECK, S.J. ROBERT. Leibniz und die Scholastik. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1894.
- NOTTER, A. Kant antinomia-tana és a keresztény iskola bölcselet. *Böles. Foly.*, 1890.
- NOWELL, W. G. St. Anselm. *Christ. Exam.*, lxxiii.
- NYS, D. Le problème cosmologique. Louvain, 1888.
La notion du temps d'après les principes de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Louvain, 1898.
La nature du composé chimique. Louvain, 1899.
La notion d'espace au point de vue cosmologique et psychologique. Louvain, 1901.
La définition de la masse. Louvain, 1901.
La divisibilité des formes essentielles. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1902.
Cosmologie ou étude philosophique du monde inorganique. Louvain, 1903; 2. ed., 1906.
- O'BRIEN, CORNELIUS. Philosophy of the Bible Vindicated. Charlotte-town, 1876.
- OCHABA, J. A lélekszellemiségéről. *Böles. Foly.*, 1897.
Ellenvetések a lélek halhatatlansága. *Böles. Foly.*, 1900.
A lélek eredetéről. *Böles. Foly.*, 1902.
- De Officiis hominis generatim, tractatus ex Summa Philosophica Fr. S. M. Roselli desumptus. Guadalaxaræ, 1851.
- OISCHINGER, J. N. C. Questiones controversæ de philosophia scholastica. Landshut, 1859.
- O'KANE, O.P., M. St. Thomas and the Beautiful in Art. *Rosary Mag.*, 1897.
The Conservation of Energy and Voluntary Activity. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1903.
- O'LEARY, CORNELIUS M. Decline of the Study of Metaphysics. *Cath. World*, 1880.
- OLIVIERI, SER. Tractatus de ideologia ex operibus Divi Thomæ Aquinatis de promptus. Genuæ, 1890.
- O'MAHONY, T. Az apriorikus összetevő ítéletekről. *Böles. Foly.*, 1889.
- O'MAHONY, T. J. Summa Summæ, sc. Summa Theologiæ D. Thomæ Aq. Analytico-Synthetica Synopsis. In usum scholarum clericorum ad mentem D. Thomæ in questionibus occurrentibus, præsertim philosophicis, certius citiusque aperiendam, necnon ipsius Summæ et gratiorem et utiliorem reddendam. Dublinii, 1877.
- ORTÍ Y LARA, J. M. Krause y sus discípulos convictos de panteísmo. Madrid, 1861.
Lecciones sobre el sistema de filosofía panteística de Krause. Madrid, Tejada, 1865.

- ORTÍ Y LARA, J. M. La Ciencia y la Divina Revelación ó demostración de que entre las ciencias y los dogmas de la religión católica no pueden existir conflictos. Madrid, 1881.
 Lógica. Novísima edición, Madrid, 1885.
 Lecciones sumarias de metafísica y filosofía natural según la mente del Angélico Doctor Santo Tomás de Aquino. Madrid, 1887.
 Cartas de un filósofo integrista al director de La Unión Católica. Madrid, 1889.
 Principios de Psicología según la doctrina de Santo Tomás de Aquino, mirando el estado actual de la cultura moderna. Madrid, 1890.
 Los grandes arcanos del Universo o filosofía de la naturaleza. Madrid, 1890.
 Curso abreviado de metafísica y filosofía natural. 2. ed., Madrid, imp. S. Francisco de Sales, 1898 ff.
 ORTIZ, S.J., LUIS. La Vida. Bogotá, 1893.
 OSTLER, H. Die Psychologie des Hugo von St. Viktor. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Psychologie in der Frühscholastik (Beiträge). Münster, 1906.
 OTTEN, A. Allgemeine Erkenntnisslehre des hl. Thomas. Paderborn, 1882.
 Das Reich des Geistes und des Stoffes. Paderborn, Schöningh, 1900.
 OZANAM, A. F. Dante et la philosophie catholique au XIII. siècle. Paris, 1839; 6. ed., 1872; Engl. by Boissard, London, 1854; by L. D. Pychowska, New York, 1897.
 PACE, EDWARD A. The Growth and Spirit of Modern Psychology. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1894.
 The Relations of Experimental Psychology. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1895.
 St. Thomas and Modern Thought. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1896.
 The Soul in the System of St. Thomas. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1898.
 The World-copy, according to St. Thomas. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1899.
 The Concept of Immortality in the Philosophy of St. Thomas. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1900.
 The Argument of St. Thomas for Immortality. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1900.
 The Study of Philosophy. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1901.
 St. Thomas' Theory of Education. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1902.
 The Psychology of St. Thomas. *Manhattan Quart.*, 1904.
 Modern Substitutes for Soul. *New York Rev.*, 1906.
 Introspection and Experiment. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1907.
 PAGANINI, P. San Tommaso d'Aquino e il Rosmini. Pisa, 1857.
 PALERMO, FRANCESCO. San Tommaso, Aristotele e Dante, ovvero, Della Prima Filosofia Italiana. Firenze, 1869.

- PALLEN, CONDE B. Scepticism and its Relations to Modern Thought. *Cath. World*, 1883.
 God and Agnosticism. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1886.
- PALMER, M. Aristoteles és a logikai formalizmus. *Böles. Foly.*, 1886.
- PALMIERI, S.J., DOMINICUS. Institutiones Philosophicae; 3 vol., Romae, 1874-76.
 Animadversiones in recens opus De Mente Concilii Viennensis. Romae, 1878.
- PAPAGNI, O.P., T. La mente di San Tommaso intorno alla mozione divina nelle creature e le questioni che vi hanno rapporto. Benevento, D'Alessandro, 1902.
- PAQUET, L. A. Rosmini et son système. *Canada français* (Québec), 1888.
 Disputationes theologiae seu Commentaria in Summam Theologicam D. Thomae. 6 vol., Québec, Demers, 1893-1903; 2. ed., Rome, Pustet, 1907 ff.
- PAROCCHI, L. M. Del lume dell'intelletto secondo la dottrina dei SS. dottori Agostino e Bonaventura. Torino, 1881.
- PARSONS, R. Abelard. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1889.
- DE PASCAL, G. Philosophie morale et sociale. Paris, Lethielleux, 1894-96.
- DE PASCAL, VINCENT. Saint Thomas et le R. P. Bottalla. Poitiers, 1878.
- PASSAGLIA, CARLO. Della dottrina di San Tommaso secondo l'enciclica di Leone XIII. Torino, 1880.
- PASTÉ, ROM. Il "De Anima" di Aristotele commentato da San Tommaso. *Scuola catt.*, 1904-6.
- PATISS, S.J., GEORG. Das A B C der Scholastik. Wien, 1866.
- PAULSEN, FRIEDRICH. Das jüngste Ketzergewicht über die moderne Philosophie. *Deutsche Rundschau*, 1898.
 Katholicismus und Wissenschaft. *Deutsche Stimmen*, 1899.
 Kant, der Philosoph des Protestantismus. *Kantstudien*, 1899.
 Philosophia militans; gegen Klerikalismus und Naturalismus. Berlin, 1901.
- PAZMÁNY, PETRI. Opera omnia partim e codd. mss. partim ex editionibus antiquioribus edita per Senatum academię reg. scient. universitatis Budapestin. recensionem accurante Collegio Professorum Theolog. in ead. univ. Budapestini, 1894 ff.
- PECCI, GIUSEPPE. Parafrasi e dichiarazione dell'opuscolo di San Tommaso "De ente et essentia." Roma, 1882.
 La Prédétermination physique et la science moyenne. Traduit de l'Italien, avec approbation de l'auteur par l'abbé E. Deshayes. Préface par Mgr. Sauvé; Le Mans, 1885; German by J. Triller, Paderborn, 1888.
- PECCI, JOACHIM. Cf. LEO XIII.

- PÉCSI, GUSTAVUS. *Cursus brevis philosophiæ*. Esztergom, 1906 ff.
Crisis axiomatum modernæ Phisicæ. Esztergom, 1908.
- VON PEEZ, ALEX. *Scholastik in der Gegenwart*. Berlin, 1900.
- PÈGUES, O.P., TH. M. *Théologie thomiste d'après Capreolus*. *Rev. thom.*, 1900.
 Pouvons-nous arriver à connaître Dieu? *Rev. thom.*, 1900.
 Commentaire français littéral de la Somme Théologique de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Toulouse, 1906.
- PEILLAUBE, E. *Théorie des Concepts; existence, origine, valeur*. Paris, Lethielleux, 1895.
- PEKÁR, K. *A filozófia története*. Budapest, 1903.
- PELAGATTI, G. S. Tommaso d'Aquino. La legge della carità. Siena, s. Bernardino.
- PELLEGRINI E SCANDONE. *Pro Roccasecca, patria di S. Tommaso d'Aquino (con documenti)*. Napoli, d'Auria, 1903.
- PELLEGRINO, CARLO. San Tommaso e gli studi del clero. *Scuola catt.*, 1904.
- PELZER, A. *L'Institut supérieur de philosophie à l'Université catholique de Louvain*; 1904.
- PEREIRA GOMEZ DE CARVALHO, C. *Elementos de Philosophia*. Coimbra, 1894.
- PÉREZ, PONCIANO. *Discurso académico pronunciado en la solemne Distribución de Premios la noche del 27 de Agosto de 1880; y una breve noticia de la Academia Filosófico-Téológica de Sto. Tomás de Aquino*. León, 1880.
- PERLES, J. *Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundenene erste lateinische Uebersetzung des maimonidischen Führers*. Breslau, 1875.
- PERUJO, NIETO ALONSO. *Lexicon philosophico-theologicum in quo scholasticorum vocabula, locutiones, termini, distinctiones, effata et axiomata, declarantur et explicantur; ex optimis quæ hucusque prodierunt litteraliter compilatum quamplurimisque vocibus et adnotationibus auctum*. Matriti, 1884.
- PESCH, S.J., CH. *Der Gottesbegriff*. Freiburg, Herder, 1885.
- PESCH, S.J., HEINR. *Liberalismus, Socialismus und christliche Gesellschaftsordnung*. 2. ed., Freiburg, Herder, 1900.
- PESCH, S.J., TILMANN. *Die Philosophie der Vorzeit in ihrer Bedeutung für die Zukunft*. 1875.
 Die scholastische Bildungsmethode. 1875.
 Die Haltlosigkeit der modernen Wissenschaft. Kritik der Kant'schen Vernunftskritik. Freiburg, 1877.
 Die Teleologie in der mittelalterlichen Naturphilosophie. 1877.
 Das Weltphänomen, eine erkenntnistheoret. Studium. Freiburg, 1881.
 Die grossen Welträthsel. Philosophie der Natur. Freiburg, 1883-84; 2. ed., 1892; Span. by E. Vogel and J. M. Orti y Lara, 1890.

- PESCH, S.J., TILMANN. Christliche Lebensphilosophie. Gedanken über religiöse Wahrheiten. Weiteren Kreisen dargeboten. 5. ed., Freiburg, Herder, 1900; French by Biron, Paris, Lethielleux, 1901.
- Institutiones philosophiæ naturalis secundum principia S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Friburgi, Herder, 1880; 2. ed., 1897.
- Institutiones logicales secundum principia S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Friburgi, Herder, 1888-90.
- Institutiones psychologiæ secundum principia S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Friburgi, Herder, 1896-98.
- Seele und Leib als zwei Bestandtheile der einen Menschensubstanz. Fulda, 1901.
- Le Kantisme et ses erreurs. Traduit de l'allemand. Paris, Lethielleux, 1897.
- PETRI, GIUSEPPE. Intorno al sistema filosofico del P. Matteo Liberatore della C. di G. Lucca, 1861.
- Antonio Rosmini e i Neo-Scolastici. Torino, 1878.
- Sull'odierno conflitto tra i Rosminiani e i Tomisti. Torino, 1879.
- Sulle dottrine ideologiche del P. G. M. Cornoldi d. C. d. G. e sulle accuse d'ontologismo e panteismo contro la teosofia di A. Rosmini osservazioni. Lucca, 1883.
- PETRONIO. In Summam catholicæ fidei contra Gentiles elucidationes. Neapoli, 1886.
- PETZ, FR. Philosophische Erörterungen über die Unsterblichkeit der menschlichen Seele. Mainz, 1879.
- PFEIFER, FRANCIS XAVIER. Die Kontroverse über das Beharren der Elemente in der Verbindungen von Aristoteles bis zur Gegenwart. Programm, Dillingen, 1879.
- Albertus der Grosse, Eine Biographie-Festschrift. Donauwörth, 1881.
- Harmonische Beziehung zwischen Scholastik und moderner Naturwissenschaft mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas von Aquin und die Worte der Enzyklika Aeterni Patris. Augsburg, 1881.
- Die Lehre von der Seele als Wesensform, betrachtet vom Gesichtspunkte der Kunst und Aesthetik. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1888-9.
- Ein Argument des hl. Thomas für die Einheit der Seele im Menschen, beleuchtet durch Tatsachen der Pnysik, Psychologie und Mystik. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1889.
- Analogien zwischen Naturerkenntnis und Gotteserkenntnis, den Beweisen für das Dasein Gottes und naturwissenschaftlicher Beweisführung mit Bezugnahme auf Kants Kritik der Gottesbeweise. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1890-91.
- Psychologische Lehren der Scholastik bestätigt und beleuchtet durch Thatsachen der katholisch-religiösen Mystik. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1891.

- PFEIFER, FRANCIS XAVIER. Widerstreiten die Wunder den Naturgesetzen, oder werden letztere durch erstere aufgehoben? *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1893-94.
- Über den Begriff der "Auslösung" und dessen Anwendbarkeit auf Vorgänge der Erkenntnis. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1897-98.
- Ueber einen Versuch, die darwinische Selektionstheorie auf die Erkenntnistheorie und den Wahrheitsbegriff anzuwenden. *Natur. und Offenbarung*, 1898.
- Moderner Pantheismus und seine Widerlegung durch ein Wunder der Neuzeit. *Theol. prakt. Monatschrift*, 1900.
- Kritische Beleuchtung der Fragmente von J. Tyndall über Gebet und Wunder. *Theol. prakt. Monatschrift*, 1900.
- Gibt es im Menschen unbewusste psychische Vorgänge? *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1901.
- PHILATÈTE. Saint Thomas et la définition aristotélicienne. *Sc. cath.*, 1898.
- Les Philosophes du moyen âge (Textes et études). Collection publiée par l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie de l'Université de Louvain. Cf. De Wulf.
- Philosophia Lacensis sive Institutionum Philosophiæ Scholasticæ edita a Presbyteris Societatis Jesu in Collegio quondam B. Mariæ ad Lacum disciplinas philosophicas professis. Friburgi Brisgovix. Herder. Cf. Hontheim, Meyer, Pesch.
- The Physiological Psychology of St. Thomas. *Dublin Rev.*, 1882.
- PIAT, CLODIUS. L'Intellect actif ou le rôle de l'activité mentale dans la formation des idées. Paris, Leroux, 1891.
- La liberté. Historique du problème au XIX. siècle. Paris, Lethielloux, 1894-95.
- L'Idee. Paris, Poussielgue, 1895.
- La Personne humaine. Paris, Alean, 1897.
- Destinée de l'homme. Paris, Alean, 1898.
- La Morale chrétienne et la moralité en France. Paris, 1905.
- De l'Intuition en Théodicée. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1908.
- PICAVET, FRANÇOIS. De l'origine de la scolastique en France et en Allemagne. Paris, Leroux, 1888.
- L'histoire des rapports de la théologie et de la philosophie. Paris, Colin, 1888.
- Le mouvement néo-thomiste. *Rev. Philos.*, 1892.
- La scolastique. Paris, Colin, 1893.
- La science expérimentale au XIII. siècle. Paris, Bouillon, 1894.
- Galilée, destructeur de la scolastique, fondateur de la science et de la philosophie moderne. Paris, Fontemoing, 1895.
- Les travaux récents sur le néo-thomisme et la scolastique. *Rev. Philos.*, 1896.
- Abélard et Alexandre de Hales, créateurs de la méthode scolastique. Paris, Leroux, 1896.

- PICAVET, FRANÇOIS. Roscelin, philosophe et théologien. Imp. nationale, 1896.
- Les discussions sur la liberté au temps de Gottschalk, de Raban Maur, d'Hincmar et de Jean Scot. Paris, Picard, 1896.
- La renaissance des études scolastiques. *Rev. bleue*, 1896.
- Gerbert, un pape philosophe d'après l'histoire et d'après la légende. Paris, Leroux, 1897.
- Entre camarades. Paris, 1901.
- La valeur de la scolastique (In Bibl. du Cong. Intern. de Philos., t. 4). Paris, 1902.
- Travaux d'ensemble sur la scolastique et le néo-thomisme. *Rev. Philos.*, 1902.
- Esquisse d'une histoire générale et comparée des philosophies médiévales. Paris, Alcan, 1905; 2. ed., 1907.
- Deux directions de la théologie catholique au XIII. siècle. Saint Thomas d'Aquin et Roger Bacon. *Rev. de l'hist. des religions*, 1905.
- L'enseignement de l'Histoire générale et comparée des philosophies du moyen âge. Paris, Lib. gen. de Droit, 1906.
- Nos vieux maîtres, Pierre de Maricourt, le Picard, et son influence sur Roger Bacon. *Rev. i. ens.*, 1907.
- PICCIRELLI, S.J., J. M. De Deo Disputationes Metaphysicæ. Lut. Paris, Lecoffre, 1885.
- Disquisitio metaphysico-theologica, critica de distinctione actuatam inter essentiam existentiamque creati entis intercendente, ac præcipue de mente Angelici Doctoris circa eandem quæstionem. Paris, Lecoffre, 1906.
- PICHERIT, L. Le R. P. Carbonelle et l'Encyclique Æterni Patris. Angers, 1883.
- PIDAL Y MON, ALEJANDRO. Sistemas filosóficos. Madrid, 1873.
- Santo Tomás de Aquino, su vida, historia de sus reliquias, sus obras, su doctrina, sus discípulos, sus impugnadores, el siglo XIII, la Orden de Santo Domingo, etc. Madrid, 1875.
- Discursos leídos ante la Real Academia de las ciencias morales. Madrid, 1887.
- PIERSON, ALLARD. Disquisitio historico-dogmatica de realismo et nominalismo quatenus vim habuerint in præcipuis placitis theologie scholasticæ, inde ab Anselmo usque ad Gulielmum ab Occamo. Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1854.
- PIETROPAOLO, F. L'anima nel mondo greco e romano, nel medio evo e nella filosofia moderna. Roma, Capaccini, 1898.
- PIGNATARO, S.J., FELICE. De Deo Creatore. Commentarius in I. P. Summa Theologicæ S. Thomæ. Roma, 1894.
- PILLET, A. De S. Thoma omnium scholarum christianarum patrono. *Rev. sc. eccl.*, 1899.
- PLASSMANN, H. E. Die Schule des hl. Thomas von Aquino. Soest, 1857-62.

- PLASSMANN, H. E. Die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquino über die Bescheidenheit und Demuth. Paderborn, 1858.
- PLATER, S.J., CHARLES. A Starting-point in Ethics. *New York Rev.*, 1907.
- PLUMTBE, E. H. Roger Bacon. *Contemp. Rev.*, 2, 364.
- PLUZANSKI, E. Essai sur la philosophie de Duns Scot. Paris, Thorin. 1887; Ital. by A. Alfani, Firenze, 1892.
- POHL, KARL. Das Verhältniss der Philosophie zur Theologie bei Roger Bacon. Neustrelitz, 1893.
- POHLE, JOS. Ueber die actuale Bestimmtheit des unendlich Kleinen. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1893.
- POLAND, S.J., WILLIAM. The Weapons of So-called Modern Science. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1888.
- Triple Order of Science, Physics, Metaphysics and Faith. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1889.
- Fundamental Ethics. An ethical analysis, conducted by way of question and answer for use in classes of Moral Philosophy. Boston, Silver Burdett, 1894.
- Laws of Thought or Formal Logie. New York and Boston, Silver Burdett, 1894.
- Rational Philosophy. The Truth of Thought or Material Logie. A Short Treatise on the Initial Philosophy, the Groundwork Necessary for the Consistent Pursuit of Knowledge. New York, Silver Burdett, 1896.
- Modern Materialism and its Methods in Psychology. *Amer. Eccles. Rev.*, 1897.
- POLONINI, CARLO. Accordo delle dottrine dell'abate Rosmini con quelle di San Tommaso dimostrato. Parabiago, 1879.
- POOLE. Illustrations of the History of Mediaeval Thought. London, 1884.
- Pope Leo XIII and Modern Studies. *Dublin Rev.*, 1880.
- PORTMANN, A. Die Systematik in den Questiones disputatæ des hl. Thomas von Aquin. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1891.
- Das System der theologischen Summa des hl. Thomas von Aquin. oder übersichtlicher und zusammenhängender Abriss der Summa theol. mit Anmerkungen und Erklärungen der termini technici. Lucern, 1894; 2. ed., 1903.
- PORTUGAL, J. M. DE J. El Amable Jesus en los misterios de su Divino Corazón, según la enseñanza del Doctor Angélico. México, 1897.
- La Santa Voluntad de Dios. Homenaje de adoración, amor y gratitud al Divino Redentor de los Hombres al terminar el siglo XIX. Madrid, 1900.
- Itinerario de la Tierra al Cielo. Barcelona, Subirana, 1906.
- POSCH, J. Az idö elmélete. Budapest, 1898.
- POSPISIL. Philosophie nach den Grundsätzen des hl. Thomas von Aquino. 1885.

- POTTERS, P. Compendium philosophiæ moralis sen ethice secundum principia S. Thomæ ad usum scholarum. Bredæ, 1892.
- POUCHET, F. A. Histoire des sciences naturelles au moyen âge ou Albert le Grand et son époque considérés comme point de départ de l'école expérimentale. Paris, 1853.
- DE POULFIQUET, FR. A. Le point central de la controverse sur la distinction de l'essence et de l'existence. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1906.
- POWER, S. J., M. A. The So-called Problem of Evil. A Protest. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1889.
- DEL PRADO, O. P., N. De Veritate fundamentali philosophiæ christianæ. Friburgi Helvet., 1899.
- Characteres essentielles physice præmotionis juxta doctrinam Divi Thomæ. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1901.
- De diversis perfectionis gradibus in physica præmotione. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1901-2.
- Concordia liberi arbitrii cum divina motione juxta doctrinam D. Thomæ et S. Augustini. *Div. Thom.*, 1902.
- De Gratia et libero arbitrio. Friburgi, lib. St. Paul, 1907.
- PRANTL, KARL. Der Universalienstreit im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert. *Sitzber. Acad. Wiss. München, phil. Cl.*, 1864.
- Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande. Leipzig, 1855-70.
- Michael Psellus und Petrus Hispanus. Leipzig, 1867.
- PREGER, WILH. Geschichte der deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter. München, 1874.
- PRESTON, T. S. God and Reason: Lectures upon the Primary Truths of Natural Religion. New York, Coddington, 1884.
- PRISCO, GIUSEPPE. Elementi di Filosofia speculativa. 5. ed., Napoli, 1879; Span. by Gabino Tejado, Madrid, 1866.
- La Metafisica della morale. Napoli, 1865.
- Gioberti e la scolastica. *Scienza e Fede*, xxxvii.
- Gioberti e l'ontologismo. Napoli, 1867.
- Sull'opposto indirizzo della filosofia scolastica e moderna considerazioni storico-critiche. Napoli, 1868.
- Lo Heghellianismo considerato in se e nel suo svolgimento storico. Napoli, 1868.
- Principii di Filosofia del Diritto. Napoli, Manfredi, 1872.
- PRONÁSZKA, O. A causa formalis gyözelme a modern terminészetbölselet fölött. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1888.
- Az értékek realizmusá. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1889.
- Isten és a világ. Esztergom, 1891.
- A szabadakarat és a testmozgási mechanizmus. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1894.
- Föld és ég. Esztergom, 1901.
- PROSPER, P. H. L'exposition littéraire et doctrinale de la Somme théologique de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Lierre, Van In, 1894.
- PROTOIS, F. Pierre Lombard, son époque, sa vie ses écrits et son influence. Paris, 1881.

- PUCCINI, ROBERTO. La scienza e l'ateismo. Siena, s. Bernardino, 1890.
 La scienza e il libero arbitrio con appendice sul recente libro:
 "Il pessimismo e l'evoluzione di G. Trezza." Siena, s. Bernardino,
 1890.
 Introduzione alla Sociologia. Siena, s. Bernardino.
 Il Progresso morale e le sue leggi. Siena, s. Bernardino.
 La morale studiata nei suoi fondamenti. Siena, s. Bernardino, 1902.
 L'istituto superiore di filosofia nell'Università cattolica di Lovaina
 (1890-1904) secondo la relazione del Dottore A. Pelzer. *Scuola
 catt.*, 1904.
- PUIGCEBVER. Philosophia Sancti Thome Aquinatis auribus hujus tem-
 poris accommodata. 1824.
- QUINN, BERNARD. Philosophia mentalis. Prima Pars. Logica. 1901.
- RABUS, L. Zur Philosophie des Thomas von Aquino. *Neue Kirchl.
 Zeitsch.*, 1890.
- RADEPENNING, W. Ueber den Einfluss der aristotelischen Ethik auf
 die Moral des Thomas von Aquino. Jena, 1875.
- RADZISZEWSKI, J. Odrodzenie filozofji scholastycznej. Przegląd Filo-
 zoficzny. Warszawa, 1901.
- RAGEY, P. Vie intime de saint Anselme. Paris, 1877.
 Saint Anselme professeur. *Ann. Philos. chr.*, 1889.
 Histoire de saint Anselme. 2 vol., Paris, 1890.
 Vie de saint Anselme. Paris, 1891.
 L'argument de saint Anselme. Paris, Delhomme & Briguët, 1893.
- RÄHSE, H. Des Joh. Erigena's Stellung zur mittelalter Scholastik und
 Mystik. Rostock, 1874.
- RAMELLINI, C. Commentaria in Quæstiones XXVII-LIX, 3. P. Summæ
 Theologicæ de Mysteriis Christi in lectiones distributa. *Div.
 Thom.*, 1897-99.
- RAMIERE, S.J., II. L'accord de la philosophie de saint Thomas et de
 la science moderne au sujet de la composition des corps. Paris,
 1877.
- RAMIREZ, SAMUEL. La Filosofia Positivista. Bogotá, Zalamea, 1898.
- RAND, EDW. K. Johannes Scottus. München, Beck, 1907.
- RAPAICS, R. A metafizika jogosultása es szükségessége. *Böles. Poly.*,
 1900.
- RASHBALL, H. Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. Oxford,
 1895.
 Nicholas de Ultrieuria: a medieval Hume. *Proceed. Aristotel. Soc.*,
 1907.
- RASTERO. Institutiones philosophicæ. Genova, 1874.
- RATISBONNE, M. T. Histoire de saint Bernard et de son siècle. 2 vol.,
 Paris, 1841; 6. ed., 1864; Engl. by H. G. Manning, Dublin, 1859.
- RAYMOND. Les œuvres de Duns Scot. *Etudes francisc.*, 1907.
- REGENER, FR. Die Methode der Scholastik. *Deutsche Schule*, i, 7, 8.

- DE RIGNON, S.J., THEODORE. Bannez et Molina, histoire, doctrines, critique métaphysique. Paris, Oudin, 1883.
 Nature de la science métaphysique. *Ann. Philos. chr.*, 1885.
 Métaphysique des causes d'après saint Thomas et Albert le Grand. Paris, Retaux, 1885; 2. ed., 1906.
 Travaux contemporains sur la question du libre arbitre. *Etudes relig.*, 1888.
 Bannésianisme et Molinisme. *Science cath.*, 1889.
 Bannésianisme et molinisme. Etablissement de la question et défense du molinisme. Paris, 1890.
 REGOUT, L. De H. Thomas van Aquino en Kant. Een strijd van twee werelden. *Studien*, 1904.
 REIMERS, J. Der aristotelische Realismus in der Frühscholastik. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Universalienfrage im Mittelalter. Aachen, Schweitzer, 1907.
 REINER, JOS. Der Aristotelische Realismus in der Frühscholastik. Aachen, Schweitzer, 1907.
 REINSTADLER, SEB. Elementa Philosophiæ Scholasticæ. Friburgi. 1901 ff.; 3. ed., 1907.
 REITZ, J. Die aristotelische Materialursache. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1893.
 REMER, S.J., VINC. Summa prælectionum philosophiæ scholasticæ. 2 vol., Prati, Giacchetti, 1895.
 DE RÉMUSAT, CHARLES. Abélard. Paris, 1845.
 Saint Anselme de Cantorbery. Paris, 1853; 2. ed., 1868.
 Bacon: sa vie, son temps, sa philosophie. Paris, 1857.
 RENAN, ERNEST. Averroes et l'Averroïsme. Paris, 1852; 3. ed., 1866.
 De philosophia peripatetica apud Syros. Paris, 1852.
 RENGIFO, FRANCISCO M. Santo Tomás de Aquino ante la ciencia moderna. *Rev. Col. del Rosario*, 1906.
 Repetitorium der Philosophie für Studierende der katholischen Theologie. Nach Dr. Stöckl's Lehrbuch der Philosophie. Mainz, 1899.
 RESTREPO HERNÁNDEZ, JULIÁN. Lecciones de Lógica dictadas en el Colegio Mayor de Ntra. Señora del Rosario. Bogotá, imp. Colombia, 1907.
 RETTBERG, F. Occam und Luther. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1839.
 REUSCH, F. H. Die Fälschungen in den Tractat des Thomas von Aquin gegen die Griechen. München, 1889.
 REVOLLO, PEDRO M. Religión y Ciencia. Mutua Correspondencia y Harmonía de ambas. Barranquilla, 1904.
 REY, J. L'œuvre philosophique de Mgr. d'Hulst. *Rev. cath. des Rev.*, 1897.
 REYNAUD, ALBERT. Catholic Philosophy. *N. Y. Rev.*, 1908.
 RÉZBÁNYAI, J. Az ókor kulturája. Pécs, 1888.
 A scepticismus és következményei. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1889.
 RIBEIRA, JUL. Orígenes de la filosofía de Raimundo Lulio. Madrid, Suarez, 1899.

- RIBERSANGES, G. H. *Epitome Philosophiæ christianæ. V. I. Introductio ad universam philosophiam, Logica. Placentia, 1899.*
Logica. Tabulæ synopticae. Placentia, 1901.
- RIBOLDI, A. *La Fisica di San Tommaso. Milano, Scuola cattol.*
- RICHARD, JEAN. *Etudes sur le mysticisme spéculatif de saint Bonaventure, docteur du XIII. siècle. Heidelberg, 1869.*
- RICHARD, T. *Etude critique sur le but et la nature de la scolastique. Rev. thom., 1904-5.*
- RICHTLER, A. *Wesenheit und Dasein in den Geschöpfen nach d. Lehre d. hl. Thomas von Aquin. Regensburg, 1887.*
- RICKABY, S.J., JOHN. *First Principles of Knowledge. New York, Benziger, 1889; 2 ed., London, Longmans, 1901.*
General Metaphysics. New York, Benziger, 1890; 3 ed., London, Longmans, 1902.
Spirit and its Struggles after a Definition. Month, 1901.
- RICKABY, S.J., JOSEPH. *Moral Philosophy or Ethics and Natural Law. New York, Benziger, 1889; 3 ed., London, Longmans, 1903.*
Aquinas Ethics, or the Moral Teachings of St. Thomas. New York, 1892.
Oxford and Cambridge Conferences, 1897-1899. London, Burns & Oates, 1900.
Political and Moral Essays. New York, Benziger, 1902.
Free-will and Four English Philosophers: Hobbes, Locke, Hume and Mill. London, Burns & Oates, 1906.
Of God and His Creatures (annotated Engl. transl. of the Summa contra Gentiles). London, 1906.
- RIES, J. *Die Gotteslehre des hl. Bernard. Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th., 1906.*
Das geistliche Leben in seinen Entwicklungsstufen nach der Lehre des hl. Bernard. Freiburg, Herder, 1906.
- RIETTER, ANTON. *Die Moral des hl. Thomas von Aquino. München, 1858.*
- RIGG, J. H. *Roger Bacon and Lord Bacon. Method. Quart., xviii.*
- RIGG, J. M. *St. Anselm of Canterbury. London, 1896.*
- DE RIGNANO, A. M. *Principio protologico dell'intelligenza umana, ossia il vero concetto dell'itinerarium mentis ad Deum di San Bonaventura. Roma, 1863.*
- RINTELEN, FRITZ. *Leibniz's Beziehungen zur Scholastik. Arch. Gesch. Philos., 1902-3.*
- RITSCHL, A. *Die nominalistische Gotteslehre. Jahrb. deutsche Theol., 1868.*
- RITTER, A. H. *Geschichte der christlichen Philosophie. Einleitung in die Geschichte der Philosophie im Mittelalter. Hamburg, 1841.*
Platon und Aristoteles im Mittelalter. Philologus, 1846.
- DE ROCHELEY, O. J. *Saint Bernard, Abélard et le rationalisme moderne. Paris and Lyon, 1867.*

- RODRIGUEZ DE CEPEDA. *Eléments de Droit naturel*. Trad. de l'esp. par A. Onclair. Paris, Retaux, 1890.
- ROLFES, EUGEN. *Die aristotelische Auffassung vom Verhältnisse Gottes zur Welt und zum Menschen*. Berlin, 1892.
- Die Textauslegung des Aristoteles bei Thomas von Aquin und bei den Neuren. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1894.
- Die vorgebliche Präexistenz des Geistes bei Aristoteles. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1895.
- Die substantiale Forme und das Begriff der Seele bei Aristoteles. Paderborn, 1896.
- Die Controverse über die Möglichkeit einer anfanglosen Schöpfung. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1897.
- Die Gottesbeweis bei Thomas von Aquin und Aristoteles erklärt und vertheidigt. Köln, 1898.
- Des Aristoteles Schrift über die Seele übersetzt und erklärt. Bonn. Hanstein, 1901.
- Die Unsterblichkeit der Seele nach der Beweisführung bei Plato und Aristoteles. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1902.
- Aristoteles' Metaphysik. Uebersetzt und mit einer Einleitung und erklärenden Anmerkungen versehen. Leipzig, 1904.
- Zum Gottesbeweis des hl. Thomas. Herrn Prof. Simon Weber in Freiburg zur Erwiderung. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1907.
- RONAYNE, S.J., MAURICE. *Religion and Science: Their Union Historically Considered*. New York, Collier, 1879.
- God Knowable and Known*. New York, Benziger, 1888; 2. ed., 1902.
- RONDINA, S.J., FRANC. X. *Compendio de philosophia theoretica e pratica para uso da mocidade portuguesa na China*. 2 vol., Macau, 1869-70.
- ROQUETTE, G. *Saint Bonaventure et son siècle*. Paris, sixième centenaire, 15 juillet 1874.
- Le Cardinal saint Bonaventure*. Lyon, 1874.
- DE LA ROSA, AGUSTÍN. *Consideraciones filosóficas sobre la Verdad y la Certidumbre*. Guadalajara, 1870.
- ROSELLI, SALV. MAR. *Compendium Summae philosophicae*. Romae, 1837.
- ROSIN, D. *Die Ethik des Maimonides*. Breslau, 1876.
- ROSSET, MICHAELIS. *Prima principia scientiarum, seu philosophia catholica juxta D. Thomam ejusque interpretatores respectu habito ad hodiernam disciplinarum rationem*. Paris, Vives, 1866; 2. ed., 1873.
- ROSSIGNOLI, GIOV. *Principii di Filosofia secondo la dottrina di San Tommaso esposti ad uso principalmente dei Seminari*. 2. ed., Novara, 1889.
- Natura e classificazione delle potenze dell'anima*. Palermo, 1892.
- Il determinismo nella sociologia positiva. Nuova rivendicazione del libero arbitrio contro sofismi nuovi o rinovellati*. 2. ed.,

- Siena, s. Bernardino, 1901; Span. by M. Garcia Barzanallana, Barcelona, 1903.
- ROSSIGNOLI, GIOV. La scienza della religione esposta in compendio ad uso delle scuole. Parma, Fiacadori, 1901.
- La modernità, il modernismo e la riforma scolastica dei nostri Seminari. *Scuola cattol.*, 1907.
- ROTIE, TANCÈDE. Traité de droit naturel théorique et appliqué. Paris, Larose, 1892-96.
- ROTHENFLUE, S.J., FRANC. Institutiones Philosophiæ theoreticæ in usum prælectionum. Lyon and Paris, ed. altera, 1846-52.
- ROTT, F. A fogalmak tárgyi értéke. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1899.
- A belső érzekről. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1901.
- Darvinizmus és kifejlődés. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1904.
- A csoda természettudományos szempontból. Budapest, 1907.
- ROURE, S.J., LUCIEN. Doctrines et Problèmes. Paris, Retaux, 1900.
- DU ROUSSAUX, L. Eléments de Logique. Bruxelles, 1894.
- ROUSSELOT. Etudes sur la philosophie dans le moyen âge. 3 vol., Paris, 1840-42.
- ROUX-LAVERGNE. Compendium Philosophiæ. Paris, 1856.
- ROYCE, JOSIAH. Pope Leo's Philosophical Movement and its Relation to Modern Thought. *Boston Evg. Transcript*, July 29, 1903; *Rev. Cath. Pedag.*, 1903.
- RUBINI. Lezioni elementari di Fisica. Bologna, 1880.
- RUBIN, SALOMO. Spinoza und Maimonides. Ein psychologisch-philosophisches Antitheton. Wien, 1868.
- Heidenthum und Kabbala. Die kabbalistische Mystik, ihrem Ursprung wie ihrem Wesen nach gründlich aufgeheilt und populär dargestellt. Wien, 1893.
- A RUBINO, JOANNES and A. M. A VICETIO. Lexicon Bonaventurianum. Venice, 1880.
- RUBIO Y ORS, JOAQUIN. Los supuestos conflictos entre la religión y la ciencia, ó la obra de Draper ante el Tribunal del sentido común, de la razón y de la historia. Madrid, 1887.
- RUIBAL, A. Doctrina de Santo Tomás acerca del influjo de Dios en las acciones de las criaturas racionales y sobre la ciencia media. Trad. del italiano con exposición crítica y comentarios y un estudio de los puntos fundamentales de la presciencia y cooperación divina. Santiago, 1901.
- RUIZ, DIEGO. Elevación al conocimiento. Lull, maestro de definiciones. Nueva disertación sobre los principios del método en la historia de los sistemas. Barcelona, 1906.
- RUIZ AMADO, R. Oscurantismo medioeval. *Razón y Fe*, 1907.
- RULE, MARTIN. Life and Times of St. Anselm. 2 vols., London, 1883.
- RUNZE, G. Der ontologische Gottesbeweis: krit. Darstellung seiner Geschichte seit Anselm bis auf die Gegenwart. Halle, 1881.

- RUSSO, S.J., NICOLAUS. *Summa philosophica juxta scholasticorum principia*. Boston, 1885.
- De philosophia morali prælectiones. Neo Eboraci, Benziger, 1890.
- SACHS, JOS. *Grundzüge der Metaphysik im Geiste des hl. Thomas von Aquin*. Paderborn, 1896.
- DE SAINT-ELLIER, L. *Pourquoi faut-il croire en Dieu? Réponse de la science*. Paris, Bonne Presse, 1900.
- La Providence. Dieu s'occupe-t-il de nous? Paris, Bonne Presse, 1901.
- SAISSET, E. *Essais sur la philosophie et la religion au XIX. siècle*. Paris, 1845.
- Roger Bacon, sa vie et son œuvre. *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, 1861.
- Précurseurs et disciples de Descartes. Paris, 1862.
- SALA, E. *Metafisica*. Vol. 1: Teodicea. Cremona, 1902.
- SALERNO, STEFANO. *Compendio ragionato della filosofia basata sopra la dottrina dell'Angelico Dottore San Tommaso e riordinato per domande e riposte, all'uso degli alunni dei Seminari, Istituti religiosi e Scuole liceali*. Riposto, Denaro, 1898.
- SALIS SEEWIS, S.J., FRANCESCO. *La scienza materialistica e le cause finali*. *Civ. catt.* 1877-79.
- Della conoscenza sensitiva. Prato, Giacchetti, 1881.
- La vera dottrina di San Agostino, di San Tommaso e del P. Suarez contro la generazione spontanea primitiva. Roma, 1897.
- SALOMON, MICHEL. *Une vue de la philosophie du siècle*. *Quinzaine*, 1901.
- SALVANY, M. *El concepto de Dios segun Santo Tomás*. *Rev. de España*, 1885.
- SALVATOR, MUSCIO. *In Epistolam Encyclicam S. S. D. N. Leonis D. P. Papæ XIII D. Thomæ Aquinatis philosophiam instaurantis vicesimo recurrente anno obsequium*. Foggia, 1899.
- DE SAN, S.J., LOUIS. *Institutiones metaphysicæ specialis*. Vol. I. *Cosmologia*. Lovanii, 1881.
- Tractatus de Deo uno*. Pars Prior præter tres partes prioris ipsius tractatus continens disquisitionem de mente S. Thomæ circa Prædeterminationis Physicas. Lovanii, Peeters, 1894.
- SÁNDORFFY, F. *Gondolkodástan*. Gyulafehérvár, 1888.
- Istentan. Gyulafehérvár, 1890.
- SANSEVERINO, CAJETANO. *Institutiones Logicæ et Metaphysicæ*. Neapoli, 1851.
- Philosophia christiana eum antiqua et nova comparata*. Neapoli, 1862.
- Elementa philosophiæ christianæ*. Neapoli, 1864; French by Corriol, Avignon, 1877.
- SANS-PEL. *De l'Orthodoxie de l'Ontologisme modéré et rationnel*. Nancy, Bordes, 1869.

- DE SANTA MARIA NOVA, O.F.M., ANTONIO. *Compendium notionum philosophicarum sub dialogi forma. Ad Claras Aquas*, 1886.
- SANTI, VINC. *Degli obbietti della filosofia veduti al lume della scolastica. Perugia*, 1890.
- Questione antropologica. Se l'uomo sia l'anima sola, o un composto di anima e corpo. Perugia, Guerra*, 1890.
- La questione fondamentale della teologia naturale. Perugia, Guerra*, 1890.
- SARDEMANN, FR. *Ursprung und Entwicklung der Lehre von lumen rationis aeternæ, lumen divinum, lumen naturale, rationes seminales, veritates ternæ, bis Descartes. Kassel, Röttger*, 1902.
- SARMASÁGH, G. *Adalékok a független erköles elméletéhez. Böles, Poly.*, 1896.
- SATOLLI, FR. *Enchiridion Philosophiæ: Pars Prima complectens Logicam universam. Bruna*, 1885.
- In Summam theologicam Divi Thomæ Aquinatis, De Trinitate, prælectiones habitæ in pontificio seminario romano et collegio urbano. Romæ, Propaganda*, 1887.
- De habitibus doctrina S. Thomæ Aquinatis in 1-2 qq. XLIX-LXX Summæ Theologiæ. Romæ*, 1897.
- SAUVÉ, HENRY. *De l'union substantielle de l'âme et du corps. Réponse au R. P. Bottalla. Paris, Berche & Tralin*, 1878.
- Questions religieuses et sociales de notre temps. Vérité, erreurs, opinions libres. 2. ed., Paris*, 1888.
- SCARPATI, PASQ. *Antropologia insegnata nella Somma di San Tommaso d'Aquino ed esposta nelle sue parti principali a quadri sinottici e in forma sillogistica. Napoli, tip. Prete*, 1889.
- SCHÜCHTER, M. *Az akarat szabadságáról. Budapest*, 1889.
- SCHAUB. *Die Eigenthumslehre nach Thomas von Aquin und dem modernen Sozialismus mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der beiderseitigen Weltanschauungen. Freiburg. Herder*, 1898.
- SCHREYER, SIMON B. *Das psychologische System des Maimonides. Frankfurt*, 1845.
- SCHIAVI, LORENZO. *Delle ragioni intime che esistono tra la filosofia di Aristotele e le dottrine di San Tommaso e di Dante. Torino*, 1871.
- Propedeutico allo studio della filosofia. 2. ed., Torino*, 1879.
- Logica secondo la scuola di San Tommaso ad uso degli studenti che s'iniziano nella filosofia. Padova*, 1898.
- SCHIFFINI, S. J., B. A. *Logiæ generalis Institutiones quas in Woodstockiensi Collegio SS. Cordis ad scholasticos S. J. tradebat. Ex typis Collegii*, 1873.
- S. Thomæ Aquinatis Tractatus de Homine ad usum studiosæ juventutis accommodatus. Woodstock Marylandiæ*, 1882.
- S. Thomæ Aquinatis Tractatus de Motu Hominis in Deum ad usum juventutis accommodatus. Woodstock*, 1883.

- SCHIFFINI, S. J., SANCTUS. Principia philosophica ad mentem Aquinatis. Augustæ Taurinorum, Speirani. 1886; 2. ed., 1894.
 Disputationes metaphysicæ specialis. Augustæ Taurinorum, Speirani, 1888.
 Institutiones philosophicæ ad mentem Aquinatis tribus voluminibus jam evolutæ, ab eodem auctore nuper in compendium redactæ. Augustæ Taurinorum, 1889.
 Disputationes philosophiæ moralis. 2 vol., Augustæ Taurinorum. 1891.
- SCHILTZ, PETR. Summa philosophica ad mentem D. Thomæ Aquinatis in usum Seminarii Luxemburgis. Luxemburg, 1894 ff.
- SCHINDELE, ST. Beiträge zur Metaphysik des Wilhelm von Auvergne. Inauguraldissertation. München, 1900.
 Zur Geschichte der Unterscheidung von Wesenheit und Dasein in der Scholastik. München, Hofbuchdruckerei, 1900.
 Die aristotelische Ethik. Darlegung und Kritik ihrer Grundgedanken. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1902–3.
- SCHIOPPA, LOR. La psicologia tomistica e la moderna psichiatria. Napoli. Pisanzio, 1895.
- SCHLOSSER, FR. CHR. Abälard und Dulcin: Leben und Meinungen eines Schwärmers und eines Philosophen. Gotha, 1807; Paris, 1839.
- SCHMID, ALOYS. Die thomistische und scotistische Gewissheitslehre. Dillingen, 1859.
 Die perip.-schol. Lehre von den Gestirngeistern. *Athæneum* (München), 1862.
 Erkenntnisslehre. 2 vol., Freiburg, 1890.
 Das Causalitätsproblem. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1896.
- SCHMID, FRANZ. Die Kategorie der Quantität. *Zeitsch. kath. Theol.*, 1889.
 Verhältniss der Quantität zur Substanz. *Zeitsch. kath. Theol.*, 1890.
 Der Begriff des "Wahren." *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1893.
- SCHMIDT, HEINRICH. Der Mysticismus des Mittelalters in seiner Entstehungsperiode. Jena, 1824.
- SCHMIEDL, A. Studien über jüdische, insonders jüdisch-arabische Religionsphilosophie. Wien, 1869.
- SCHMITT, A. Zwei noch unbenützte Handschriften des Johannes Scotus Erigena. Bamberg, 1900.
- SCHMITT, J. Hegel dialektikájának titka. Budapest, 1892.
- SCHMOLDERS. Documenta philosophiæ Arabum. Bonn, 1836.
 Essai sur les écoles philosophiques chez les Arabes et notamment sur la doctrine d'Algazzali. Paris, 1842.
- SCHMÖLLER, L. Die scholastische Lehre von Materie und Form. Neuerdings dargestellt mit Rücksicht auf die Tatsachen und Lehren der Naturwissenschaft. Passau, 1903.

- SCHNEEMANN, S.J. *Controversiarum de divinae gratiae liberique arbitrii concordia initia et progressus.* Freiburg, 1881.
- SCHNEID, MATHIAS. *Aristoteles in der Scholastik. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philosophie im Mittelalter.* Eichstädt, 1875.
- Die Körperlehre des Joh. Duns Scotus, und ihr Verhältniss zum Thomismus und Atomismus. Mainz, Kirchheim, 1879.
- Die Philosophie des hl. Thomas und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart. Würzburg, 1881.
- Die philosophische Lehre von Raum und Zeit. Mainz, 1886.
- Naturphilosophie im Geiste des hl. Thomas. Paderborn, Schöningh, 3. ed., 1890.
- Die Willensfreiheit des Menschen und ihre heutigen Gegner. *Der Katholik*, Mainz, 1890.
- Psychologie im Geiste des hl. Thomas von Aquin. Paderborn, Schöningh, 1892.
- SCHNEIDER, ARTHUR. *Die Psychologie Alberts des Grossen (Beiträge).* Münster, 1903–6.
- SCHNEIDER, C. M. *Natur, Vernunft, Gott. Abhandlung über die natürliche Erkenntniss Gottes nach der Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquino.* Regensburg, 1883.
- Das Wissen Gottes nach der Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquino. 4 vol., Regensburg, 1884–86.
- Die katholische Wahrheit oder die theol. Summa, deutsch von C. M. Schneider. Regensburg, 1888–89.
- Die Grundprincipien des hl. Thomas und der moderne Socialismus. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1893–96.
- SCHNEIDER, L. *Roger Bacon.* Augsburg, 1873.
- SCHNEIDER, WILH. *Göttliche Weltordnung und religionslose Sittlichkeit. Zeitgemässe Erörterungen.* Paderborn, Schöningh, 1900.
- SCHONFELDER, ALCUIN. Zittau, 1873.
- SCHULTESS, KARL. *Die Sagen über Sylvester II (Gerbert).* Hamburg, 1893.
- SCHUMACHER, MATTHEW. *The Knowableness of God. Its Relation to the Theory of Knowledge in St. Thomas.* Notre Dame, Indiana, University Press, 1905.
- SCHÜTER, G. B. *Scotus Erigena.* Münster, 1838.
- SCHÜTZ, A. *Az értelmi ismeretek eredetének főbb elméletei. Bóles, Foly.*, 1903.
- Kezdet és vég a világhelyzetekben. Budapest, 1907.
- SCHÜTZ, LUDWIG. *Vernunftbeweis für die Unsterblichkeit der menschlichen Seele.* Paderborn, 1874.
- Unfreiheit und Freiheit des menschlichen Willens. 1877.
- Einleitung in die Philosophie. Paderborn, 1879.
- Der sogenannte Verstand der Thiere. 1880.

- SCHÜTZ, LUDWIG. Thomas-Lexicon. Sammlung, Uebersetzung und Erklärung der in sämmtl. Werken des hl. Thomas von Aq. vorkommenden Kunstausdrücke und wissenschaftl. Aussprüche. Paderborn, 1881; 2. ed., 1895.
- Ueber Wissenschaft und Offenbarung. 1884.
- Der hl. Thomas und sein Verständniss der Griechischen. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1895.
- In welchem Zeitpunkt tritt die vernünftige Seele des Menschen in ihrer Körper ein? Freiburg, 1898.
- SCHWALM, O.P., M.B. La propriété d'après la philosophie de saint Thomas. *Rev. thom.*, 1895.
- L'action intellectuelle d'un maître d'après saint Thomas. *Rev. thom.*, 1900.
- SCHWETS. Institutiones philosophicae. Vienna, 1873.
- SCOTUS, JOANNES DUNS. Opera omnia. Editio novissima juxta editionem Waddingi a PP. Francisc. de observ. accurate recognita. 26 vol. in-4, Parisiis, Vives, 1891.
- SÉCRÉTAN, CHARLES. La restauration du thomisme. *Rev. Philos.*, 1884.
- SEEBERG, REINHOLD. Die Versöhnungslehre des Abälard und die Bekämpfung derselben durch d. hl. Bernard. *Mitt. u. Nachr. f. d. evang. Kirche in Russl.*, 1888.
- Die Theologie des Johannes Duns Scotus. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung. Leipzig, 1900.
- SEGURA, ANDRÉS. Discurso pronunciado en la solemne Distribución de Premios del Seminario Conciliar de León, año de 1879. León, 1879.
- SEIPEL, IGNAZ. Die Lehre von der göttlichen Tugend der Liebe in d. Petrus Lombardus Büchern der Sentenzen und in der Summa theologiae des hl. Thomas von Aquin. *Der. K.*, 1906.
- SEMERIA, GIOVANNI. Scienza e Fede e il loro preteso conflitto. La Critica della Scienza. Roma, Pustet, 1903.
- SENTROUL, C. L'objet de la métaphysique selon Kant et selon Aristote. Louvain, 1905.
- Vrai thomisme contre vrai kantisme. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1906.
- Le subjectivisme kantien. Réponse à M. l'abbé Farges. *Rev. thom.*, 1907.
- SERTILLANGES, O.P., A. D. La preuve de l'existence de Dieu et l'éternité du monde. *Rev. thom.*, 1898.
- L'art et la morale. Paris, Bloud, 1899.
- Nos vrais ennemis. *Rev. thom.*, 1902.
- Les bases de la morale et les récentes discussions. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1902-3.
- L'idée de sanction peut-elle servir à prouver Dieu. *Rev. thom.*, 1903.
- L'idée de Dieu et la vérité. *Rev. thom.*, 1904-5.

- SERTILLANGES, O.P., A. D. Les sources de la croyance en Dieu. Paris, Perrin, 1904; n. ed., 1906.
- Agnosticisme ou anthropomorphisme. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1906.
- La connaissance de Dieu. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1906.
- L'idée de création dans saint Thomas d'Aquin. *Rev. sci. philos. et théol.*, 1907.
- L'âme et la vie selon saint Thomas d'Aquin. *Rev. de Philos.*, 1908.
- SESTILI, JOACHIM. De Sylvestris. Commentaria in libros quatuor contra Gentiles S. Thomae Aquinatis. Romae, 1898.
- SEYERLEX, RUD. Die gegenseitigen Beziehungen zwischen abendländischer und morgenländischer Wissenschaft, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Salomon ibn Gabirol und seine philosophische Bedeutung. Leipzig, Kaufmann, 1900.
- SHAHAN, THOMAS J. The Middle Ages. Sketches and Fragments. New York, Benziger, 1905.
- SHANAHAN, EDMUND T. Realistic Philosophy: Its Strength and Weakness. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1896.
- John Fiske on the Idea of God. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1897.
- The Idea of God in the Universe. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1898.
- The Fallacy in Evolution. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1901.
- The Language of Evolution. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1901-2.
- SHEA, GEORGE. Some Facts and Probabilities Relating to the History of Johannes Scotus surnamed Duns and concerning the genuineness of the Spagnoletto Portrait belonging to the General Theological Seminary of the U. S. Cambridge, Riverside Press, 1890.
- SHIRLEY, WALTER WADINGTON. Scholasticism. A lecture delivered before the University of Oxford, Jan. 27, 1866. Oxford, Parker & Co., 1866.
- SICHIROLLO. La mia conversione dal Rosmini a S. Tommaso. Ricerche e memorie di studi filosofici. Padova, 1882.
- SIEBECK, H. Geschichte der Psychologie von Arist. bis Thomas von Aquino. Gotha, 1884.
- Zur Psychologie der Scholastik. *Arch. Gesch. der Philos.*, 1889.
- Ueber die Entstehung der Termini "natura naturans" und "natura naturata." *Arch. Gesch. Philos.*, 1890.
- Oceam's Erkenntnisslehre in ihrer historischen Stellung. *Arch. Gesch. Philos.*, 1897.
- Die Willenslehre bei Duns Scotus und seinen Nachfolgern. *Zeitsch. f. Ph. u. ph. Krit.*, 1898.
- SIEBERT, H. Roger Bacon. Marburg, 1861.
- Un Siècle, mouvement du monde de 1880 à 1900. Paris, Oudin, 1900.
- SIEGFRIED F. P. Professor Royce and Neo-Scholasticism. *Dolphin*, 1903.
- SIGART, JOACHIM. Albertus Magnus, sein Leben und seine Wissenschaft. Regensburg, 1857; French, Paris, 1862; Engl. by Dixon, London, 1876.

SIGNORIELLO, NUNTIO. Lexicon Peripateticum Philosophico-Theologicum in quo scholasticorum distinctiones et effata præcipua explicantur. Neapoli. 1854; 2. ed., 1872.

Philosophia moralis. Neapoli, 1876; 3. ed., 1883.

SILBERNAGEL, T. Wilhelm von Occam's Ansichten über Kirche und Staat. *Hist. Jahrb.*, vii.

SIMAR. Die Lehre vom Wesen des Gewissens in der Scholastik des XIII. Jahrhunderts. Freiburg, 1885.

SIMETERRE, R. Sur les condamnations d'Aristote et de saint Thomas. *R. prat. d'apolog.*, 1908.

SIMON, JULES. Abélard et la philosophie au XII. siècle. *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, 1846.

SINIBALDI, JAC. Prælectiones philosophiæ christianæ ad mentem S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Coimbra, 1889 ff.

Elementos de Philosophia. 2 vol., Coimbra. 1892; 2. ed., 1894.

Sistema fisico di San Tommaso. *Cir. cattol.*, 1891.

SISTINI, O. Lettre romaine: Le mouvement thomiste à Rome. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1907.

SLATTERY, J. R. Scholastic Methods, their Advantages and Disadvantages. *Amer. Eccles. Rev.*, 1900.

SLEVIN, T. J. Order in the Physical World and its First Cause according to Modern Science. Transl. from the French. London, 1891.

SNELL, M. M. The Triumph of St. Thomas. *Dublin Rev.*, 1899.

SOLANA, M. La verdad transcendental segun la filosofia escolástica. Santander, Oria, 1907.

SOLER, ANT. Biografía del D. J. Balmes. Madrid, 1850.

SOLIMANI, A. Divagazioni filosofiche intorno ai sommi filosofi Tommaso d'Aquino e Antonio Rosmini. Milano, 1886.

SOLIMANUS, S.J., DOMINICUS. D. Solimani, S.J. in Collegio Romano professoris Philosophiæ moralis et juris naturæ Institutiones Ethicæ Dialecticæ Eudæmonologicæ. Romæ, 1847.

SOLLANO Y DÁVALOS, J. M. DE J. DIEZ DE. Logiæ Compendium juxta doctrinam S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Auctore P. C. Roux. In gratiam sui Seminarii ab Episcopo Leonensi multis annotationibus locupletatum. Leon, 1868; n. ed., 1900.

Vigésima segunda carta pastoral, que el primer Obispo de León, D. J. M. de J. Diez de Sollano y D. dirige á su Ilmo. y V. Cabildo, á su Seminario Conciliar, etc., publicando la enefelicia de N. S. P. el Sr. León XIII que comienza "Æterni Patris" de 4 de Agosto del presente año, sobre la Filosofia del Angélico Dr. S. Tomás de Aquino, León, 1879.

Theologica disquisitio in qua mens Ecclesiæ in definitione dogmatica de Immaculata B. Virginis Mariæ Conceptione eum mentem D. Thomæ de eadem re comparata, evidenter monstratur, juxta philosophicum et theologicum ejusdem Angelici Doctoris

systema, unam et eandem esse, nec in apice discrepare. Leon, 1880.

SOLLANO Y DÁVALOS, J. M. DE J. DIEZ DE. Obras completas del Ilmo. y Rmo. Sr. Dr. y Mtro. D. J. M. D. de Sollano y D. . . . coleccionadas por J. M. de Yermo y Parres. México, 1894.

DA SORRENTO, BONAV. S. Bonaventura e la sua dottrina. Napoli, 1890.

SORTAIS, S.J., GASTON. Traité de Philosophie. Paris, Lethielleux, 1901 ff.

De la beauté d'après Platon, Aristote et saint Augustin. Paris, Retaux, 1902.

Etudes philosophiques et sociales. Paris, Lethielleux, 1907.

DE SOUZA, JOSE SOURIANO. Lições de Philosophia elementar racional e moral. Pernambuco, 1871.

A STANISLAO, GERMANUS. Prælectiones philosophiæ scholasticæ tironibus facili methodo instituendis accommodatæ. Romæ, Pustet, 1903 ff.

STARHAHN, H. Das "opus majus" des Roger Bacon. *Kirchl. Monatschr.*, 1893.

STAUDENMAIER, FR. ANT. Johannes Scotus Erigena und die Wissenschaft seiner Zeit. Frankfurt-a-M., 1834.

STEÉCZ, G. A Fechner-féle psycho-physikai alapképlet tarthatatlansága. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1890.

A calculus infinitesimalis nivoltának fontossága keresztlény böleseleti szemponthól. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1892.

STEEG, JUL. Johannis Scoti Erigenæ de verbo divino sententia, seu Christologia. Argentorati, 1867.

STEELE, ROBERT. Metaphysica fratris Rogeri Baconis. London, 1905.

STEFINI, A. San Tommaso. Bergamo, 1900.

STEIL, C.S.R., ALPH. MARIA. Ueber die Thätigkeit der vom Leibe getrennten menschlichen Seele vom Standpunkte der Philosophie. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1901.

Das Theorem der menschlichen Wesenseinheit in consequenter Durchführung. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1902.

STEIN. Moses Maimonides. La Haye, 1846.

STEIN, L. Antike und mittelalterliche Vorläufer des Occasionalismus. *Arch. Gesch. Philos.*, 1889.

STENTUP. Das Dogma von der zeitlichen Welterschöpfung. Innsbruck, 1870.

STÖCKL, ALBERT. Speculative Lehre vom Menschen. Würzburg, 1859.

De argumento, ut vocant, ontologico. Monasterii, 1862.

Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. Mainz, 1864-66.

De Joh. Scoto Erigena. Münster, 1867.

Lehrbuch der Philosophie. 3 vol., Mainz, 1868; 7. ed., 1892.

Ibid. Neu bearbeitet von G. Wohlmuth. Mainz, 1905.

Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie. 2 vol., Mainz, 1870; 3. ed., 1889.

- STÖCKL, ALBERT. Grundriss der Aesthetik. Mainz, 1871.
 De S. Anselmi de liberi arbitrii notione sententia. *Ind. lect. Monaster. per menses æstiv.*, 1871.
 Die thomistische Lehre vom Weltanfang in ihrem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange. *Katholik*, 1883.
 Geschichte der neueren Philosophie von Baco und Cartesius bis zum Gegenwart. 2 vol., 1883.
 Lehrbuch der Aesthetik. Mainz, 1889.
 Geschichte der christlichen Philosophie zur Zeit der Kirchenväter. Mainz, Kirchheim, 1891.
 Grunzüge der Philosophie. 1892.
 Grundgriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. 1894.
 Lehrbuch der Apologetik. Mainz, Kirchheim, 1895.
 Dr. Albert Stöckl, Domeapitular und Lycealprofessor in Eichstätt. Eine Lebensskizze. Verfasst von einem seiner Schüler. Mainz, 1896.
 STÖLZLE, REMIGIUS. Abaelards verloren geglaubter Tractat "De unitate et trinitate divina." *Histor. Jahrb. d. Görresgesell.* xi: München, 1890.
 Abaelardo. 1121 zu Soissons verurtheilter Tractatus de unitate et trinitate divina. Aufgefunden und erstmals herausgegeben. Freiburg-i-B., Herder, 1891.
 Stonyhurst Philosophical Series. Cf. Boedder, Clarke, Maher, Rickaby.
 STORRS, BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX. New York, 1892.
 STÖSSEL, D. Salomo ben Gebirol als Philosoph und Förderer der Kabbala dargestellt. Leipzig, 1881.
 STRÄTER, HERMANN. Ein modernes Moralsystem. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1901.
 STRAUB, S.J., ANTON. Die Aseität Gottes. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1903.
 STRAUB, JOH. Der teleologische Gottesbeweis und seine Gegner. Würzburg, Stürtz, 1894-95.
 Gewissheit und Evidenz der Gottesbeweise. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1897.
 STROBEL, A. Die Lehre des sel. Albertus Magnus über das Gewissen. Sigmaringen, 1901.
 STUCKNER, J. Az életelv egysége az emberben. *Bölc. Foly.*, 1900.
 Élet és öntudat. *Bölc. Foly.*, 1902.
 Az öntudatlan a psychologiában. *Bölc. Foly.*, 1903.
 SUAREZ, S.J., FRANCISCUS. Opera. 26 vol., Besançon and Paris, 1856-62.
 Opuscula sex inedita. Bruxelles, 1859.
 SUCONA Y VALLÉS. Metaphysicæ adnotationes. Tarragona, 1883.
 Philosophie Institutiones. Tarragona, 1886.
 SULLIVAN, J. Marsiglio of Padua and William of Ockam. *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 1897.
 SURÁNYI, J. John Stuart Mill szabadságtana. *Bölc. Foly.*, 1900.
 SUTÁK, J. Geometriai Axiómák. *Bölc. Foly.*, 1898.

- SVORCIK, O.S.B., CONST. Uebersichtliche Darstellung und Prüfung der philosophischen Beweise für die Geistigkeit und die Unsterblichkeit der menschlichen Seele. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1898.
- SWEETSER, S. Abailard and Bernard. *Biblioth. Sacra*, xvii.
- SWITALSKI, B. W. Des Chalcidius Commentar zu Plato's Timäus (Beiträge). Münster, Aschendorff, 1902.
- Das Leben der Seele. Braunsberg, 1907.
- DE SYLVESTRIS, O.P., FRANC. (Ferrariensis). Commentaria in libros IV contra Gentiles S. Thomae de Aquino. Ed. novissima cura J. Sestili. Romae, 1898 ff.
- SYMPHORIEN-LOUIS, FRÈRE. Précis de Métaphysique. Montréal, 1905.
- SZABÓ, J. A jellemről. *Böcs. Foly.*, 1897.
- SZABÓ, M. A lélektan alapvonalai. Szeged, 1887.
- SZABÓ, S. A mozgás és a mozdítás lénygtani ismertetése. *Böcs. Foly.*, 1890.
- SZÉKELY, G. A qualitatív észnek pszichológiája. Gyulafehérvár, 1898.
- SZÉKELY, ST. Bölcselet és Természettudomány. *Böcs. Foly.*, 1888.
- Bölcselet és theológia. *Böcs. Foly.*, 1889.
- Az anyag nyilvánulásai és erői. *Böcs. Foly.*, 1893.
- Ösztön és ész. *Böcs. Foly.*, 1897.
- Esz és ösztön. Nagyvárad, 1898.
- SZILVEK, L. Plato vagy Aristotelész? *Böcs. Foly.*, 1889.
- A lelki tehetségek localizációjáról. *Böcs. Foly.*, 1891.
- Fizika és metafizika. Pécs, 1894.
- A hypnózis ismertetése és magyarázata. *Böcs. Foly.*, 1899.
- A szociáldemokrácia vallása. *Böcs. Foly.*, 1905.
- SZITINYAI, E. Lélektan és Logika. Budapest, 1902.
- SZOMBACH, M. A rossz mibenléte. *Böcs. Foly.*, 1890.
- TABARELLI, R. De Deo Uno in I. P. Summae Theologicae S. Thomae Aquinatis Q. II ad Q. XIV. Romae, Pustet, 1906.
- TAILLANDIER, SAINT-RENÉ. Scot Erigène et la philosophie scolastique. Paris, 1843.
- Abélard: la libre pensée au moyen âge. *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, 1861.
- TALAMO, SALVATORE. L'aristotelismo della scolastica nella storia della filosofia. Napoli, 1873; 3. ed., Siena, 1881; French, Paris, Amat, 1876.
- Il rinnovamento del pensiero tomistico e la scienza moderna. 2. ed., Siena, 1876.
- L'odierna scuola tomistica ed i suoi avversarii. 3. ed., Siena, 1879.
- L'inconscio dell'Hartmann, discorso letto nell'Acc. di Religione cattol. di Roma il dì 15 Maggio 1879. Roma, 1879.
- Una nuova forma di socialismo. Note critiche. Roma, Deselee, 1900.
- la Schiavitù nelle opere dei dottori scolastici. *Rev. intern. di sci. sociali e discipline ausiliarie*, 1907.

- TAPARELLI D'AZEGLIO, S.J., LUIGI. Saggio teoretico di diritto naturale appoggiato sul fatto. Palermo, 1840-41; 6. ed., 1857; Germ., Regensburg, 1845; French, Paris, 1857; Span., 2. ed., Madrid, imp. San José, 1884.
- Corso elementare di Natural Diritto ad uso delle scuole. Napoli, 1843; Livorno, 1851; 6. ed., Napoli, 1860; French by Ozanam, Tournai, 1864; Span., Paris, Bouret, 1875.
- Esame critico degli ordini rappresentativi nella società moderna. 2 vol., Roma, 1854; Span., Madrid, 1867.
- Le Ragioni del bello secondo i principii di S. Tommaso. Roma, 1860; Span. by E. Danero, Madrid, 1879.
- TARINO. Institutiones logicæ, metaphysicæ, ethicæ atque juris naturæ. 2. ed., Biella, 1877.
- Problema fondamentale della scienza. 1878.
- TEMPLER, BERNH. Der Unsterblichkeitsglaube bei den jüdischen Philosophen des Mittelalters. Nebst Einleitung über den Unsterblichkeitsglauben in Bibel und Talmud. Wien, Breitenstein, 1895.
- v. TESSEN-WESIERSKI, F. Die Grundlagen des Wunderbegriffes nach Thomas von Aquin. Paderborn, Schöningh, 1899.
- THAMBY, E. J. De rationibus seminalibus et immanentia. Lille, 1905.
- L'immanence et les raisons séminales, les problèmes de la vie et de l'action divines. *Rev. sci. eccl.*, 1906-7.
- THIÉRY, A. Was soll Wundt für uns sein? *Rev. Neo-Scol.*, 1898.
- Le tonal de la parole. Louvain, Inst. sup. de Philos., 1901.
- THILL, J. Das Fundamentalprincip aller Wissenschaften. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1891.
- THOMAS AQUINAS. Opera omnia; 22 vol. fol., Parmæ, Fiaccodori. 1866.
- Opera omnia jussu impensaue Leonis XIII P. M. edita. Romæ, 1882 ff.
- Excerpta philosophica (arranged and edited by P. Carbonel). 2 vol., Avignon, 1882.
- Commentaria in tres libros Aristotelis de Anima. Lovanii, 1901.
- Ueber die Regierung der Fürsten. De Reginine principum. Ein Compendium der Politik. Uebers. v. Th. Scherrer-Boccard. Lucern, 1897.
- Cf. Rickaby, C. M. Schneider.
- St. Thomas Aquinas and Mediæval Thought. *Dublin Rev.*, 1906.
- THOMES, NIE. Commentatio litteraria et critica de S. Thomæ Aquinatis operibus. Berolini, 1874.
- Divi Thomæ Aquinatis opera et præcepta quid valeant ad res ecclesiasticas politicas sociales. Berolini, 1875.
- THÜRING, H. Die Willensfreiheit des Menschen nach der Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquino. *Kathol. Schweiz. Bl.*, 1891.
- THURROT, CHARLES. De l'organisation de l'enseignement dans l'Université de Paris au moyen âge. Paris, 1850.

- TIBY, P. Deux convents au moyen âge, ou l'Abbaye de Saint-Gildas et le Paraclét au temps d'Abélard et d'Héloïse. Paris, 1851.
- TOMCSÁNYI, L. Az ember akaratának szabadsága. Kalocsa, 1890.
- TONGIORGI, S.J., SALV. Institutiones Philosophicæ. 3 vol., Romæ, 1861.
 Institutiones philosophicæ S. Tongiorgi, S.J. ab eodem in compendium redactæ. Neo-Eboraci, 1869.
 Institutiones philosophiæ moralis in compendium redactæ. Ed. 3., Senis, 1891.
- DE TOXQUÉDEC, J. La notion de vérité dans la "philosophie nouvelle." *Etudes*, 1907.
- TORNATORE, J. B. De natura rei materialis et immaterialis. Placentiæ, 1882.
 Principia S. Thomæ, quibus innititur doctrina "De ente communi." *Div. Thom.*, 1890.
 De humanæ cognitionis modo, origine ac profectu ad mentem Sancti Thomæ. Placentiæ, 1891.
- TÖRÖK, M. Az alchimia alapgondolata és a legujable termesztudományi felfogás. *Bölcs. Foly.*, 1905.
- TORREGROSSA, IGN. Le scienze sperimentali e la scolastica o la restaurazione filosofica. Palermo, 1891.
- TORRE-LSUNZA, R. Filosofía cristiana. Madrid, Rivadeneyra, 1897 ff.
- TOSTI, L. Storia di Abelardo e dei suoi tempi. Napoli, 1854.
- TOWNSEND, W. J. The Great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages. An account of their lives, and the services they rendered to the Church and the world. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1881.
- TBOTTA. Saggio di Metafisica. Napoli, 1879.
- TUCCIMEI, G. Cause efficienti e finali. *Riv. intern. di sci. soc.*, 1902.
- TÜRBAU. Rhabanus Maurus. München, 1900.
- TURNER, S. History of Anglo-Saxons. 3 vol., Longmans, 1852.
 History of Middle Ages in England. 3 vol., Longmans, 1853.
- TURNER, WILLIAM. Erigena and Aquinas. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1897.
 Gerbert, pope and philosopher. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, 1898.
 History of Philosophy. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1903.
 Recent Literature on Scholastic Philosophy. *J. Philos. Psy. Sci. Meth.*, 1904.
 A Contemporary French School of Pragmatism. *New York Rev.*, 1906.
 The Catholic Point of View in Philosophy. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1907.
 Mnemonic Verses in a Ninth Century MS.: A Contribution to the History of Logic. *Philos. Rev.*, 1907.
- TYRRELL, GEORGE. The Church and Scholasticism. *Amer. Cath. Quart.*, 1898.
 The Faith of the Millions. London, Longmans, 1902.
- UCCELLI, PIETRO ANT. Dissertazione sopra gli scritti autografi di S. Tommaso d'Aquino. Milano, 1845.

- UCCELLI, PIETRO ANT. Memoria sui testi esaminati da San Tommaso d'Aquino nell' opuscolo contro gli errori de' Greci. Napoli, 1870.
- UDE, JOANNIS. Doctrina Capreoli de influxu Dei in actus voluntatis humanae secundum principia Thomismi et Molinismi collata. Graeci, Sumptibus "Styriae." 1905.
- Die Psychologie des Strebevermögens im Sinne der Scholastik. Graz, 1907.
- UEBINGER, JOS. Begriff der Philosophie. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1893.
- UGARTE DE ERCILLA, E. Método psicológico-experimental. Experimentación. *Razón y Fé*, 1907.
- Carácter material, externo y divisible de la sensación. *Razón y Fé*, 1907.
- UREAIN, CAROL. De concursu divino scholastici quid senserint. Paris, Thorin, 1894.
- URRÁBURU, S.J., J. J. Institutiones Philosophicae quas Romae in pontificia universitate Gregoriana tradidebat. 8 vol., Vallisoleti, Hernandez, 1890 ff.
- Origen de los seres vivientes, según sus diversas especies y examen del transformismo. Bilbao, 1896.
- Principios fundamentales de Antropología. Obra escrita en latin y puesta en castellano por A. Madariaga, S.J. Madrid, 1901.
- Compendium Philosophiae Scholasticae. 5 vol., Matriti, Lopez, 1902-4.
- El verdadero puesto de la filosofía entre las ciencias. *Razón y Fé*, 1901-2.
- El principio vital y el materialismo ante la ciencia y la filosofía. *Razón y Fé*, 1904-5.
- VACANDARD, E. Abélard et sa lutte avec saint Bernard, sa doctrine, sa méthode. Paris, 1881.
- Vie de saint Bernard, abbé de Clairvaux. Paris, 1895.
- VACANT, J. M. A. De certitudine iudicii quo assentimur existentiae revelationis. Taranne, 1878.
- De nostra naturali cognitione Dei dissertatio. Taranne, 1879.
- Notes sur les séminaires de philosophie en France. *Ext. de la Rev. des Sci. eccl.*, 1880.
- Le mouvement et la preuve de l'existence de Dieu par la nécessité d'un premier moteur. 1880.
- La théorie de la connaissance selon saint Thomas d'Aquin et selon Duns Scot. *Ann. Philos. chr.*, 1889.
- L'objet de l'entendement d'après saint Thomas et d'après Duns Scot. *Ann. de Philos. chr.*, 1889.
- La Parole et le langage d'après saint Thomas et d'après Duns Scot. *Ann. Philos. chr.*, 1890.
- Etudes comparées sur la philosophie de saint Thomas et sur celle de Duns Scot. Paris & Lyon, 1891.

- VACANT, J. M. A. D'où vient que Duns Scot ne conçoit point la volonté comme saint Thomas d'Aquin. *Rev. du clergé franç.*, 1897.
- VAJÓ, J. A test viszonya a térhez. *Böles. Foly.*, 1899.
- VALDARNINI. Esperienza e ragionamento in Rogero Bacone. Roma, 1896.
- VALENSISE, D. Una difficoltà filosofico-teologica creduta insolubile. Nicastro, 1900.
- VALENTINER. Schopenhauer als Scholastiker. Eine Kritik der Schopenhauerschen Philosophie mit Rücksicht auf die gesammte kantische Neu-scholastik. Leipzig, 1901.
- VALENZUELA, MARIO. Apuntamientos sobre el principio de utilidad. Bogotá, imp. de Ortiz, 1857.
- VALERGA, LEONARDO. Del Tradizionalismo e del Semirationalismo. Genova, 1861.
- DEL VALLE RUIZ, RESTITUTO. Raimundo Lulio. *Ciudad de Dios*, 1898.
- VALLET, PAUL. Praelectiones philosophicae ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis. Paris, Roger, 1879; n. ed., 1891; Span. by G. Rosas, Bogotá 1886-89.
- Histoire de la Philosophie. Paris, 1881; 5. ed., 1897.
- L'idée du beau dans la philosophie de saint Thomas. Paris, 1888.
- Le Kantisme et le Positivisme, étude sur les fondements de la connaissance humaine. Paris, 1887.
- La Tête et le Cœur, étude physiologique, psychologique et morale. Paris, Roger & Chernoviz, 1891.
- La vie et l'hérédité. Paris, Retaux, 1892.
- La propriété, sa nature, ses titres, ses bienfaits, ses charges, ses limitations, son avenir. Lyon, Vitte, 1900.
- Dieu principe de la loi morale. Paris, Bloud & Barral, 1900.
- Evolution, progrès et liberté. Paris, Bloud & Barral, 1900.
- Les fondements de la connaissance et de la croyance. Paris, 1905.
- VALOIS, N. Guillaume d'Auvergne. Paris, 1880.
- VALVERDE TELLEZ, E. Apuntaciones históricas sobre la filosofía en México. México, Herrero, 1896.
- La verdad. México, 1897.
- Crítica Filosófica. México, 1904.
- Bibliografía filosófica mexicana. México, tip. Diaz de León, 1907.
- VANDERBERG. De ideis divinis. Boisledue, 1872.
- VÁRNAY, A. A keresztény etika és a filozófiai morál újabb rendszere. Budapest, 1896.
- VARVELLO, FRANC. Praelectiones cosmologiae, pneumatologiae et theologiae naturalis. August. Taurin., off. Salesiana, 1896.
- Institutiones philosophicae. Ethica. August. Taurin., 1902.
- VASSAL, A. De Usu et Abusu Scholasticae Disputationis. *Amer. Ecol. Rev.*, 1900.
- VAUGHAN, ROGER BEDE. The Life and Labors of St. Thomas of Aquin. London, 1871-72; Albany, 1874.

- VAUGHAN, ROGER BEDE. *Life and Labors of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Abridged and edited by D. Jerome Vaughan. 2 ed., New York, 1891.
- VEDER, G. R. *Dissertatio de Anselmo Cantuariensi*. Lugd. Bat., 1832.
- VENTURA DE RAULICA, J. *La Philosophie chrétienne*. Paris, 1861; Ital., Napoli, 1862; Span., Madrid, 1864.
- VENTUROLI. *Del Panteismo e Materialismo nelle scienze naturali*. Bologna, 1865.
- VERCELLONE. *Di Sant'Agostino e San Tommaso ricongiunti alla odierna filosofia dei maestri cattolici*. Napoli, 1864.
- VERMEERSCH, S.J., A. *Quaestiones de iustitia ad usum hodiernum scholasticae disputatae*. Brugis, Bryaert, 1901.
- VESPIGNANI, ALF. MER. *Il Rosminianismo ed il lume dell'intelletto umano*. Studio critico-filosofico. Bologna, 1888.
- Dell'intelletto agente e dell'intelletto possibile*. Parma, 1892.
- In liberalismum universum Doctore Angelico duce et pontifice Summo Leone XIII trutina*. *Dir. Thom.*, 1897-98.
- VIGNA, L. *Sant'Anselmo, Filosofo*. Milano, 1899.
- VILLA, AGUSTIN F. *Vocabulario de Términos Escolásticos para la mejor inteligencia de los escritores de la Edad Media, especialmente de Santo Tomás de Aquino (auctor J. M. Zama Mellinio)*. Traducida y aumentada. Guadalajara, 1879.
- A VILLAFRANCA, G. *Compendium Philosophiae juxta dogmata D. Thomae, D. Bonaventurae et Scoti, ad hodiernum usum accommodatum*. Toulouse, tip. s. Cyprien, 1899-1901.
- VILEMAIN. *Les amours, les malheurs et les ouvrages d'Abélard et d'Héloïse*. Paris, 1835.
- VINATI, JOANNES. *Relationum definitio et divisio ad mentem S. Thomae*. *Dir. Thom.*, 1890-91.
- De principio causalitatis animadversiones criticae*. *Dir. Thom.*, 1897.
- Natura et genesis principii causalitatis*. *Dir. Thom.*, 1898.
- De Universalium realitate*. *Dir. Thom.*, 1899.
- VINCENT, L. *Précis de philosophie scolastique*. Beyrouth, 1885.
- VOGL. *Literarische, historische Notizen über den mittelalterlichen Gelehrte von Beauvais*. Freiburg-i-B., 1843.
- VOGELS, S.J., IS. *Vraagstukken der Zielkunde*. Verstand en Vrije Wil. Amsterdam, 1900.
- VOGL, S. *Die Physik Roger Bacon*. Erlangen, 1906.
- VOLPI, R. *Lectiones philosophiae moralis*. Romae, 1900.
- VYCHODIL. *Beweise für die Existenz Gottes und ihre Geschichte*. 1889.
- WALKER, JOHN. *Essay on the Origin of Knowledge according to the Philosophy of St. Thomas*. London, 1858.
- WALSH, JAMES J. *Medieval Universities*. *Rosary*, 1907.
- The Thirteenth Greatest of Centuries*. New York, Cath. Summer Sch. Press, 1907.

- WALTER, F. Das Eigenthum nach der Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquino u. d. Socialismus. Freiburg, 1895.
- WARD, WILLIAM GEORGE. Mill's Denial of Necessary Truth. *Dublin Rev.*, 1871.
- Mill's Denial of Free Will. *Dublin Rev.*, 1874.
- Appendix on Free Will. *Dublin Rev.*, 1874.
- Mr. Mill's Philosophical Position. *Dublin Rev.*, 1874.
- A Reply on Necessary Truth. *Dublin Rev.*, 1874-75.
- Mill on the Foundation of Morality. *Dublin Rev.*, 1872.
- Mill on Causation. *Dublin Rev.*, 1876.
- The Reasonable Basis of Certitude. *Dublin Rev.*, 1878.
- Free Will. *Dublin Rev.*, 1879.
- Supplementary Remarks on Free Will. *Dublin Rev.*, 1879.
- Mr. Shadworth Hodgson on Free Will. *Dublin Rev.*, 1880.
- The Extent of Free Will. *Dublin Rev.*, 1881.
- Philosophy of the Theistic Controversy. *Dublin Rev.*, 1882.
- WEBER, SIMON. Der Gottesbeweise aus der Bewegung bei Thomas v. Aq. auf seinem Wortlaut untersucht. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik und Erklärung der Summa contra gentiles. Freiburg-i-B., Herder, 1902.
- VAN WEDDINGEN, A. Essai critique sur la philosophie de saint Anselme de Cantorbéry. Bruxelles, 1875.
- L'Encyclique de S. S. Léon XIII et la restauration de la philosophie chrétienne. Bruxelles, 1880.
- Sylloge argumentorum, quibus a Scholæ christianæ Doctoribus veritas humanæ cognitionis et scientiæ certitudo comprobatur. *Div. Thom.*, 1881.
- Albert le Grand, le maître de saint Thomas. Bruxelles, 1881.
- Essai d'introduction à l'étude de la philosophie critique, les bases de l'objectivité de la connaissance dans le domaine de la spontanéité et de la réflexion. Bruxelles, Hayez, 1889.
- WEHOFFER, TH. M. Anordnungen Leo XIII. über das Thomasstudium. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1896.
- Die geistige Bewegung im Anschluss an die Thomas-Encyclica Leo XIII. vom 4 Aug. 1879. Wien, 1897.
- WEILL, ERNST. Der Commentar des Maimonides. Arab. Text mit hebräischer Uebersetzung. Berlin, 1891.
- WEINSBERG, L. Der Mikrokosmos, ein Angeblich im 12. Jahrh. von dem Cordubenser Josef ibn Zaddik verfasstes philosoph. System, nach seiner Echtheit untersucht. Breslau, 1889.
- WEIS, CH. Hugonis de Sancto Victore methodus mystica. Paris, 1839.
- WEISS, O.P., ALB. M. Die Kunst zu leben. Freiburg-i-B., Herder, 1900.
- WEISS, J. H. Biographien berühmter jüdischer Gelehrten des Mittelalters. 1. Heft: Rabbi Moses ben Maimon. Wien, 1881.
- WEISS, K. Ueber den Begriff der Tugend im allgemeinen nach der Lehre des hl. Thomas v. Aquin. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1893.

- WEISS, M. Ueber mariologische Schriften des Albertus Magnus, *primordia novae bibliographiae beati A. M.* Paris, 1898.
- WEISS, S. Philo von Alexandrien und Moses Maimonides. Halle, 1884.
- WELCH, A. C. Anselm and his Work. New York, Scribner, 1901.
- WENHAM, JOHN G. On the Formation of Knowledge. *Dublin Rev.*, 1885.
- WERDENICH, E. A társadalom és az igazságos munkabér. *Böles. Foly.*, 1896.
- A földbirtokjog főbb tételei Aristotelesnél és a ker. büleseletben. *Böles. Foly.*, 1902.
- Természetes Istentan. Győr, 1905.
- WERNER, CARL. Der heilige Thomas von Aquino. Regensburg, 1859.
- Franz Suarez und die Scholastik der letzten Jahrhunderts. 2 vol., Regensburg, 1861; 2. ed., 1889.
- Wilhelms von Auvergne Verhältniss zu den Platonikern des 12. Jahrh. (Sitzungsberichte d. kais. Akad. d. Wiss., 1873).
- Die Psychologie des Wilhelm von Auvergne. Wien, 1873.
- Aleuin und sein Jahrhundert. Paderborn, 1876.
- Die Psychologie und Erkenntnisslehre des Johannes Bonaventura. Wien, 1876.
- Die Psychologie und Erkenntnisslehre des Johannes Duns Scotus. Wien, 1877.
- Die Sprachlogik des Johannes Duns Scotus. Wien, 1877.
- Der Entwicklungsgang der mittelalterlichen Psychologie von Aleuin bis Albertus Magnus. Wien, 1877.
- Die Psychologie, Erkenntniss- und Wissenschaftslehre des Roger Baco. Wien, 1879.
- Die Kosmologie und allgemeine Naturlehre des Roger Baco. Wien, 1879.
- Johannes Duns Scotus. Wien, 1881.
- Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters. 3 vol., Wien, 1881–87.
- Die nominalisirende Psychologie der Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters. *Sitzber. Akad. Wiss.*, Wien, 1882.
- WETZEL, M. Die Lehre des Aristoteles von der Gerechtigkeit und die Scholastik. Warburg, 1881.
- WILD, J. Ueber die Echtheit einiger Opuscula des hl. Thomas. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1906.
- WILKENS, A. Peter Abälard. Bremen, 1855.
- WILKS, W. and M. The Three Archbishops. London, 1858.
- WILLEMS, C. Die obersten Seins- und Denkgesetze nach Aristoteles und dem hl. Thomas von Aquin. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1901.
- Die Erkenntnisslehre des modernen Idealismus. Trier, 1906.
- Institutiones philosophicae. 2 vol., Treveris, 1906.
- WILLIS, T. F. The Foundation of Philosophy. *Dublin Rev.*, 1902.
- WILLMANN, O. Geschichte des Idealismus. Braunschweig, 1896 ff.

- WILLMANN, O. Didaktik als Bildungslehre nach ihren Beziehungen zur Socialforschung und zur Geschichte der Bildung. Braunschweig, 3. ed., 1903.
- Die kath. Wahrheit als Schlüssel zur Geschichte der Philosophie. München, 1901.
- WILLNER, HANS. Des Adelard von Bath Traktat "De eodem et diverso" (Beiträge). Münster, 1903.
- WINDELBAND. Geschichte der Philosophie. Freiburg-i-B., 1892.
- WINTERTON, F. The Lesson of Neo-Scholasticism. *Mind*, 1888.
- WITTMANN, M. Die Stellung des hl. Thomas von Aquin zu Avencebrol (Beiträge). Münster, Aschendorff, 1899.
- Zum Problem der Pflicht. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1904.
- Zur Stellung Avencebrols (Ibn Gebirols) im Entwicklungsgang der arabischen Philosophie (Beiträge). Münster, 1905.
- WOLF, M. Moses ben Maimun's acht Capitel, arabisch und deutsch, mit Anmerkungen. Leipzig, 1863.
- WORMS, M. Die Lehre von der Anfanglosigkeit der Welt bei den mittelalterlichen arabischen Philosophen des Orients und ihre Bekämpfung durch die arabischen Theologen (Beiträge). Münster, Aschendorff, 1901.
- WOTSCHKE, TH. Fichte und Erigena. Halle, 1896.
- DE WULF, MAURICE. L'exemplarisme et la théorie de l'illumination spéciale dans la philosophie de Henri de Gand. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1894.
- Histoire de la philosophie scolastique dans les Pays-Bas et la principauté de Liège jusqu'à la Révolution française. Louvain, Cyst-pruyt, 1895.
- Les théories esthétiques propres à saint Thomas. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1895-96.
- Etudes sur Henri de Gand. Louvain, 1895.
- Etudes historiques sur l'esthétique de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Louvain, 1896.
- Le problème des universaux dans son évolution historique du IX. au XIII. siècle. Berlin, 1896.
- Les lois organiques de l'histoire de la psychologie. Berlin, 1897.
- De speciebus intentionalibus dissertatio historico-critica. *Dir. Thom.*, 1897.
- Qu'est-ce que la philosophie scolastique? *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1898.
- La synthèse scolastique. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1899.
- Histoire de la philosophie médiévale précédé d'un aperçu sur la philosophie ancienne. Louvain and Paris, 1900; 2. ed., 1905.
- Augustinisme et Aristotélisme au 13. siècle. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1901.
- Le Traité "De Unitate Formae" de Gilles de Lessines. Louvain, 1901.
- La notion de philosophie scolastique. *Rev. Philos.*, 1902.
- Kantisme et néo-scholastique. *Rev. Néo Scol.*, 1902.

- DE WULF, MAURICE. Méthodes scolastiques d'autrefois et d'aujourd'hui. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1903.
- La décadence de la scolastique à la fin du moyen âge. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1903.
- Etudes sur la vie, les œuvres et l'influence de Godefroid de Fontaines. Louvain, 1904.
- Introduction à la philosophie néo-scolastique. Louvain and Paris, Alcan, 1904; Engl. by P. Coffey, London, Longmans, 1907.
- Première Leçon d'Esthétique. *Rev. Néo-Scol.*, 1907.
- DE WULF, M. & A. PEIZER. Les Quatre Premiers Quolibets de Godefroid de Fontaines. Louvain, 1904.
- ZANON, GIANANTONIO. Principii di fisica secondo la dottrina dell'ilemorfismo moderno.
- ZAVALA, M. Polémica. Colección de artículos sueltos. Mérida de Yucatán, 1896.
- ZIESCHÉ, KURT. Die Lehre von Materie und Form bei Bonaventura. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1900.
- Die Naturlehre Bonaventuras. *Philos. Jahrb.*, 1908.
- ZIGLIARA, O.P., T. M. Osservazioni su alcune interpretazioni di G. C. Uaghs sull'ideologia di San Tommaso d'Aquino. Viterba, 1870.
- Della luce intellettuale e dell'ontologismo secondo la dottrina di S. Bonaventura e Tommaso d'Aquino. 2 vol., Roma, 1874.
- Summa Philosophica in usum scholarum. 3 vol., 1876; 8. ed., Paris, Briguet, 1891; Span. by Medina Perez, 1901.
- De mente concilii Viennensis in definiendo dogmate unionis animæ humanis cum corpore. 1878.
- Theses philosophice. 1881-83.
- Œuvres philosophiques. Trad. de l'italien par l'abbé Murgue. 3 vol., Paris and Lyon, Vitte, 1883.
- ZIGON, FR. De scientia media seu Thomismi cum Molinismo concordia. Görz, 1893.
- Zur Lehre des hl. Thomas von Wesenheit und Dasein. *Jahrb. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1904.
- ZITO, P. Metafisica generale o filosofia prima e fondamentale. Siena, s. Bernardino.
- ZMAVC, JOHANN. Die Principien der Moral bei Thomas von Aquin. *Arch. Gesch. Philos.*, 1899.
- Die psychologisch-ethische Seite der Lehre Thomas' von Aquin über die Willensfreiheit. *Jahr. Ph. sp. Th.*, 1899.
- Die Werththeorie bei Aristoteles und Thomas von Aquin. *Arch. Gesch. Philos.*, 1899.
- ZOLTVÁNYI, J. Az æsthetika történetéből. *Bölc. Foly.*, 1896.
- ZORZOLI, EMMAN. La questione di S. Bonaventura: "De cognitionis humane supreme ratione" commentata e difesa contro le rossminiane interpretazioni di S. Casara. Torino, tip. Salesiana, 1890.

INDEX

- ABELARD, Moderate realism of, 25;
on Roscelin's nominalism, 20;
identifies philosophy and theology, 30; condemned by the Church, 23.
- Abstraction, Theory of, 110 ff.; rejected by Berkeley, 111.
- Act and Potency, Scholastic theory of, 49 ff.
- ALBERT THE GREAT, on the universal, 24; on induction, 44; on chemical combination, 90.
- ALEXANDER OF HALES'S theory of universal matter, 94.
- ALVARADO, 176.
- AMAURY OF BENE, condemned by the Church, 23.
- ANAXIMANDER'S conception of philosophy, 28.
- ANAXIMENES'S conception of philosophy, 28.
- ANSELM, on relation of faith and reason, 30; ontological argument of, 127.
- ARISTOTLE, ground of the preference given to in the Middle Ages, 166; his conception of philosophy, 28; his logic, 41; on motion, 50; distinguishes four kinds of causes, 69; his definition of the soul, 110; on pure actuality, 132; his ethical system, 138 ff.
- ARRILLAGA, on Scholasticism, 186.
- Atomism, born in ancient Greece, 82; modified in modern times, 83; revived by Dalton, 105; difficulties of, 102.
- Attributes of God, 131 ff.; negative and positive, 133 ff.
- AUGUSTINE, identifies philosophy and religion, 29; on matter and form, 89.
- AVELING, 230-1, 251.
- AZARIAS, BROTHER, 238 ff., 251.
- BACON (FRANCIS), his conception of philosophy, 29.
- BACON (ROGER), on induction, 44.
- BAEUMKER, 200-1, 251.
- BALLERINI, 172, 252.
- BALMES, philosophical work of, 176 ff., 252; on substance, 62.
- BARBERIS, 170, 253.
- VAN BECELAERE, 240, 254.
- BERKELEY, rejects abstraction, 111 ff.
- BERNARD, protects mysticism, 23.
- BESSE'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 211-2, 255; on Roman Thomism, 168 ff.
- BLANC'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 206-7, 256; on Scholastic philosophy, 17, 32.
- BOEDDER, 230, 256.
- BONAVENTURE'S theory of universal matter, 94; new edition of works by Franciscans of Quaracchi, 36, 173.
- BOXNETTY, condemned by the Church, 13.
- BOSCOVICH'S theory of nature, 83, 101.
- BOSSUET, Thomism of, 154; on internal change in system of doctrine, 8.
- BOUTROUX, on Aristotle's philosophy, 49.
- BRANN'S ontologism, 232-3.
- BRICEÑO, 188, 258.
- BROWNSON'S influence upon Amer-

- jean Catholics, 232; on Balmes, 176.
- BEÜCKER, on Aristotle's philosophy, 19.
- CAGIGAS, 187-8, 259.
- CARO, on utilitarianism, 191-2.
- CARRA DE VAUX, on Scholastic philosophy, 32.
- CARRASQUILLA, 192-3, 261.
- CASTELEIN, 217, 261.
- CATHREIN, 198, 261.
- Cause, Scholastic theory of, 68 ff.: efficient, 69 ff.; final, 78 ff.; material, 82 ff.; formal, 82 ff.; four kinds according to Aristotle, 69; Malebranche's criticism on, 69-70; Hume's criticism on, 70 ff.
- CHRYSOSTOM, BROTHER, 239-40, 263.
- COCONNIER, 208, 264.
- COMELLAS, 178-9, 264.
- COMMER, 199, 264.
- COMTE'S opposition to metaphysics, 47.
- Conceptualism in the Middle Ages, 24; resembles Kantian philosophy, 25.
- DE CONCILIO, on pantheism, 240-1.
- CONDILLAC'S philosophy introduced into Spain, 175; into Portugal, 183.
- COPPENS, 235, 264.
- CORNOLDI'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 160, 164, 265-6; his opposition to modern philosophy, 9, 13, 164.
- Cosmology, Scholastic system of, 82 ff.
- CORSIN, on Scholastic philosophy, 19, 27; his works on Medieval philosophy, 156; on Abelard, 25; his philosophy taught in French Catholic seminaries, 203.
- CRUSIUS, on foundation of morality, 137.
- CURIE'S scientific achievements, 106.
- DALTON revives hypothesis of atoms, 105.
- DARWIN'S natural selection and the design-argument, 129-30.
- DAVID OF DINANT condemned by the Church, 23.
- DELMAS, 210-1, 268.
- DEMOCRITUS, regarded as founder of atomistic system, 82.
- DENIFLE'S works on Middle Ages, 200, 268.
- DESCARTES, regarded as a Scholastic by Pievet, 2; on substance, 61, 65; his philosophy taught in French Catholic seminaries, 203.
- Design-argument, 129 ff.
- DEWEY, on Scholastic philosophy, 25, 28.
- DIDEROT, on Duns Scotus, 18.
- DIDIOT'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 211, 269; on Kantism and Hegelianism, 12.
- Directivity, Henslow's theory of, 80.
- DOMET DE VORGES, 204-5, 269.
- DRISCOLL, contribution of to neo-Scholasticism, 241 ff., 270; on Kant, 242; on Royce's conception of God, 243.
- DUNS SCOTUS, proves existence of primordial matter, 88; his division of the *materia prima*, 94; judged by Diderot, 18; contrasted with Thomas Aquinas, 25.
- Dynamism, its theory of nature, 83; Tait's objection to, 101; deficiency of, 101.
- Efficiency, very different from constant conjunction, 75 ff.; has

- met two classes of opponents, 69; Hume's view on, 69, 70 ff.
- Eleatic school, denied the existence of motion, 50.
- Electrons, existence of detected by Thomson, 105; ultimate parts of all material beings, 67, 68, 105 ff.
- Encyclical "Æterni Patris," 162.
- Eternity explained, 133.
- Ether, its existence unanimously affirmed by physicists, 83; theory of strengthened by experiments of Maxwell, 102; of Hertz, 102; inherent constitution of, 103; Spencer's view on, 103; Kelvin on, 103; Larmor on, 104; Lodge on, 104, 105; Whet- ham on, 103; Véronnet on, 103.
- Eudemonism of Scholastic ethical system, 136.
- FARGES'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 205, 273; on motion, 50; on matter and form, 86, 91; on chemical combination, 91, 109.
- FICHTE, subtlety of, 26.
- Final Cause, 78 ff.
- FONSEGRIVE, 213, 275.
- Form, Substantial, Scholastic theory of, 84 ff., 95 ff.; properties of, 96; deduced out of the potency of matter, 100; modifications on the theory of, 108; plurality of forms in Henry of Ghent, 98; in Duns Scotus, 99; in Lessius, Cominck, Mayr, 99.
- Forma Corporalitatís, 98 9.
- Free-Will, doctrine of defined, 145 ff.; defended by Scholastics, 146; defined by Kant, 146.
- FROHSCHAMMER, condemned by the Church, 12.
- FULLERTON, on locus of mind, 122; on St. Thomas's determinism, 147.
- GARCÍA'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 188 ff., 276; on Spanish philosophy, 174-5.
- GARDAIR, 207, 276.
- GHENT, HENRY OF, his doctrine of plurality of forms, 98.
- GINEBRA'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 195, 278; his definition of matter and form, 86.
- GIOBERTI'S influence upon American Catholics, 232.
- God, proofs of existence of, 127 ff.; ontological argument, 127; argument from the moral law, 127 ff.; argument from universal consent, 128; argument from design, 129; metaphysical argument, 130; attributes of, 131 ff.; eternity of, 133, 152; immutability of, 133; infinity of 131 ff.; unity of, 132; simplicity of, 132, 135; immensity of, 133; knowledge of, 134; will of, 134; omnipotence of, 134; prescience of, 150 ff.
- GÓMEZ IZQUIERDO'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 181, 279; on Comellas, 179.
- GONZÁLEZ DE ARINTERO, 180, 279.
- GONZÁLEZ Y DÍAZ-TUÑÓN, contribution of to neo-Scholasticism, 179, 279; on Scholastic philosophy, 32; on Father Ventura, 156; on Sanseverino, 158.
- VAN DE GROOT, 228, 280.
- GUARDIA, on Spanish philosophy, 174.
- GÜNTHER, condemned by the Church, 12, 196.
- GUTBERLET, 199, 281.
- Happiness, nature of in Aristotle, 140.

- HARPER, 228-9, 282-3.
- HAURÉAT's definition of Scholastic philosophy, 14; on Scholastic philosophy, 19; on problem of universals, 20; on causes of downfall of Scholastic philosophy, 153; his works on Medieval philosophy, 156.
- Hedonism, contrasted with Scholastic ethical system, 138; criticized, 141 ff.; criticized by Ming, 236-7.
- HEGEL, on Scholastic philosophy, 19, 27; on substance, 62; on adequate knowledge of God, 126; on divine nature in old metaphysics, 134; readmits ontological argument, 127; compared to St. Thomas, 12; influence of upon Catholic philosophy in Germany, 196.
- HENSLOW's theory of directivity, 80.
- HERMES, condemned by the Church, 12, 196.
- HERNÁNDEZ Y FAJARNÉS, 180, 283.
- HERTZ, scientific experiments of, 102.
- HILL, 233, 284.
- HOBBS, on foundation of morality, 137.
- D'HULST, 212-3, 286.
- HUME, on substance, 55 ff., 64; on efficiency, 69, 70 ff.; on simplicity of soul, 116.
- HEN GABRIEL's theory of universal matter, 91.
- Idea and Phantasm, confused by Locke, 111; nature of, 111-3.
- Immensity of God, 133.
- Immutability of God, 133.
- Induction, in the Middle Ages, 44; regarded as fundamental by Mill, 42; in neo-Scholastic logic, 45.
- Infinity of God, 131 ff.
- Intellect and Sense, essential difference of, 120.
- JANVIER, on neo-Scholasticism, 35.
- JOUIN, 233, 287-8.
- KANT, regarded as a Scholastic by Picavet, 2; whether his philosophy can be interpreted from a Christian standpoint, 11; on metaphysics, 47; on substance, 61, 65; on ontological argument, 127; on moral character of our acts, 144 ff.; influence of in Spain, 175; influence of upon Catholic philosophy in Germany, 196.
- KAUFMANN, 201, 288-9.
- KELVIN, on ether, 103.
- KLEUTGEN's contribution of to neo-Scholasticism, 196-7, 290; principles of knowledge of, 197.
- LARMOR, on ether, 104.
- LEIBNIZ, on substance, 61, 65.
- LEMONS, 181, 293.
- LEO XIII. Cf. Pecci.
- LEPIDI's contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 215, 293; refutes ontologism, 215.
- LEUCIPPUS, father of atomism, 82.
- LIBERATORE's contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 167, 293-4; on chemical combination, 90.
- LOCKE, regarded as a Scholastic by Picavet, 2; on formation of names, 15; on substance, 53 ff.; philosophy of introduced into Spain, 175; into Portugal, 183.
- LODGE, on ether, 104, 105.
- Logic, Scholastic system of, 41 ff.; a complete system in the hands of Aristotle, 41; Mill's contribution to, 42.
- LORENZELLI, 165.

- Louvain, Institute of Philosophy of, its contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 217 ff.; its scientific spirit, 40; favorably judged by Besse, 168; reforms which characterize the Institute, 219; its prodigious success, 220.
- MACDONALD, 247-8, 295-6.
- MADUREIRA, 188, 296.
- MAHER's contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 229, 296; on immortality of the soul, 120.
- MALEBRANCHE, on efficient cause, 69.
- MANDONNET, 209, 297.
- DE MARGERIE, influence of Leo XIII.'s encyclical on, 163.
- DE MARIA, 171, 297.
- MARTÍ, influence of on Spanish thinking, 178.
- Matter, constitution of according to modern science, 100 ff.
- Matter, Primordial, Scholastic theory of, 84 ff.; properties of, 91; divisions of, 92; modifications on the theory of, 108.
- MAXWELL, scientific discoveries of, 102.
- MAZELLA, on fossils, 39.
- MENDIVE, 180, 299.
- MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, on Spanish philosophy, 174.
- MERCIER, philosophical work of, 218 ff., 299; on historical studies, 38; on metaphysics, 46; on final cause, 78.
- Metaphysical argument, 130-1.
- Metaphysics, existence of, 46; origin of the word, 46; defined by neo-Scholastics, 46; rejected by positivism, 47; by Kant, 47; Scholastic system of, 46 ff.
- MILLER, 212, 300.
- MILL, significance of his "System of Logic," 42; on syllogism, 43; on substance, 59 ff.; on technical language of Scholastics, 111.
- MING, 236-7, 301.
- Modern Philosophy, judged very severely by Cornoldi, 9, 13, 164; by de Maria, 171; by Cagigas, 188; by Lorenzelli, 165; by Maumus, 209; condemned by Ortí y Lara, 180; despised by O'Brien, 246-7.
- MÖHLER, 156, 196.
- Moral Philosophy, Scholastic system of, 136 ff.; contrasted with Kantian system, 144 ff.
- Moral proof of God's existence, 127 ff.
- Morality, great question of, 137; based on external principle, 137 ff.
- Motion, existence of denied by Eleatics, 50; Newtonian laws of rejected by Pécsi, 227; defined by Farges, 50.
- MUNGUÍA, 186, 302.
- Mysticism in the Middle Ages, 23.
- Neo-Scholasticism, forerunners of, 153 ff.; opposition to the word, 34, 35; universal adherence of to Thomas Aquinas, 34; modifications it has introduced on the philosophy of the Middle Ages, 37; important contributions of to study of modern philosophical literature, 39; and scientific studies, 39; its system of logic, 45; on substance, 63; on ontological argument, 127; on moral argument, 128; on metaphysical argument, 130.
- NEWTON'S laws of motion rejected by Pécsi, 227-8.
- Nominalism, leads to materialism, 21; also to mysticism, 21.

- NYS's contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 222, 304; on matter and form, 85.
- O'BRIEN'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 215 ff., 304; despises modern philosophy, 246-7.
- Occasionalism, considerations urged against, 70.
- Omnipotence of God, 134.
- Ontological argument discussed, 127 ff.; rejected by St. Thomas, 127.
- Ontologism in Belgium, 215; in the United States, 232-3; refuted by Lepidi, 215; condemned by the Church, 215.
- ORTÍ Y LARA'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 179-80, 304; on historical studies, 38; condemns modern philosophy, 180.
- ORTIZ, 194-5, 305.
- Pantheism, the outcome of realism, 22; in the Middle Ages, 22; condemned by the Church, 12, 23; de Concilio on, 241.
- PAQUET, 217, 306.
- PAULSEN, on Thomistic revival, 1.
- PECCI (LEO XIII.), sympathizes with the Thomistic revival, 159; is elected pope, 160; imposes Scholastic philosophy on Catholic world, 162; founds Institute of Louvain, 218.
- PÉSCİ'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 225 ff., 307; his theory of matter and form, 226-7; rejects Newtonian laws of motion, 227.
- PELLERME, 207, 307.
- PESCH, 198, 307.
- PEHLER, 202, 308.
- Phantasm and Idea, confused by Locke, 111; nature of, 111 ff.
- Philosophy, meaning in ancient times, 28; its essential character, 189; defined by Spence, 29; identified with theology by St. Augustine, 29; by Scotus Erigena, 30; by Abelard, 30; discriminated from theology by Thomas Aquinas, 31.
- PIAT, 213, 309.
- PICAVET'S philosophical work, 213-4, 309-10; on Thomistic revival, 2; on Scholastic philosophy, 19.
- PIDAL Y MON, 180, 310.
- PLATO, realism of, 22; ethical system of, 138.
- POLAND, 234-5, 311.
- Positivism, rejects metaphysics, 47.
- Potency, Cf. Act.
- Pragmatism, welcomed by French Catholics, 6.
- Predestination, doctrine of in St. Thomas, 150 ff.
- Prescience of God, 150 ff.
- PROUT, on atomism, 105.
- Psychology, Scholastic, 110.
- Purpose, what old Scholastics meant by, 51.
- Radio-activity, scientific observations on, 106 ff.
- Realism, professed by Plato, 21; moderate form of, 23, 24.
- DE RÉGNON, 209-10, 314.
- RÉMUSAT, on Mediæval philosophy, 156; on Abelard, 25.
- RESTREPO, 193-4, 314.
- RICKABY'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 230, 315; on Hume's philosophy, 58.
- RIVERA, on Spanish philosophy, 174.
- ROBESPIERRE, regarded as a Scholastic by Picavet, 2.

- Roman Thomists, severely judged by Besse, 168 ff.; their ignorance of science, 39.
- RONAYNE, 237-8, 316.
- RONDINA, 184, 316.
- ROSCELIN, on the universal, 20, 21; on mystery of Holy Trinity, 21; condemned by the Church, 21.
- ROUSSEAU, regarded as a Scholastic by Pievet, 2.
- ROYCE, on mysticism, 21; his proof of God's existence criticized by Driscoll, 243.
- RUSSO, 234, 318.
- RUTHERFORD, scientific achievements of, 106.
- SAINT-HILAIRE, on matter and form, 86.
- SAINT-LAMBERT, on foundation of morality, 137.
- SALIS SEEWIS, 172, 318.
- DE SAN, 216-7, 318.
- SANSEVERINO, 158, 318.
- SATOLLI, 165, 319.
- SCHIEFFINI, 171, 320.
- SCHLEGEL, on Mediæval philosophy, 156, 196.
- SCHNEIDER, on neo-Scholasticism, 35, 200.
- Scholastic Philosophy, origin of the word scholastic, 14; defined in terms of its language methods, 25; defined by its relation to theology, 27; identified with theology, 27; defined by Dewey, 25, 28; by Hauréau, 14; by de Wulf, 17; by Blanc, 17; by Weber, 27; by Tyrrell, 28; by Ueberweg, 32; by Turner, 32; is primarily and essentially the philosophy of the Middle Ages, 33; is not a single system, 20; its harmony with Catholic theology, 4; its political influence, 6; causes of downfall of, 153; cause of its revival, 7; forerunners of its revival, 153 ff.; its system of logic, 41 ff.; its metaphysics, 46 ff.; its theory of substance, 52 ff.; its theory of cause, 68 ff.; its system of cosmology, 82 ff.; its theory of matter and form, 82 ff.; its psychology, 110 ff.; its natural theology, 126 ff.; its system of morals, 136 ff.
- SCOTUS ERIGENA, on God, 22; identifies philosophy and theology, 30; condemned by the Church, 22.
- SÉCRÉTAN, on Duns Scotus's philosophy, 5; on St. Thomas's determinism, 147.
- Selection, Natural and the design-argument, 129-30.
- Sense and Intellect, essential difference of, 120.
- SERTILLANGES, 208, 322.
- Simplicity of God, 132, 135.
- SINIBALDI, 184, 324.
- SOLLANO, 186-7, 324.
- Soul, defined by Aristotle, 110; nature of, 115 ff.; intrinsically independent of body, 115; simplicity of, 115; spirituality of, 118 ff.; immortality of, 120; locus of, 121 ff.
- DE SOUSA, 184, 325.
- SPENCER'S conception of philosophy, 29; opposition of to metaphysics, 47; on ether, 103; on savage's concept of God, 128.
- SPINOZA, on substance, 66.
- STAUDENMAIER, 156-7, 196.
- STRÖCKL, 197, 325.
- Substance, Scholastic theory of, 52 ff.; Locke on, 53 ff.; Hume on, 55 ff., 64; Mill on, 59 ff.; Descartes on, 61, 65; Leibniz on, 61, 65; Kant on, 61, 65; Hegel

- on, 62; Balnes on, 62; Spinoza on, 66.
- Syllogism, nature of, 42; Medieval philosophy on, 26; Mill on, 43; praised by Leibniz, 26.
- TAINE, on Scholastic philosophy, 19.
- TAIT, on dynamism, 101.
- TALAMO, 165 ff., 327.
- TAPARELLI, 172, 328.
- TERTULLIAN'S system of philosophy, 29.
- THALES'S conception of philosophy, 28.
- Theology, natural and revealed, 126; its relation to philosophy, 10, 31; identified with philosophy by St. Augustine, 29; by Scotus Erigena, 30; by Abelard, 30; discriminated from philosophy by Thomas Aquinas, 31.
- THOMAS AQUINAS'S doctrine of unity and immutability of truth, 8; on relation of philosophy and theology, 31; on primordial matter, 87; on locus of the soul, 124; on God's ubiquity, 125; on Anselm's ontological argument, 127; on pure actuality, 132; on immensity of God, 133; on simplicity of God, 135; and free will, 147 ff.; on predestination, 150 ff.; obsolete doctrines of, 35; contrasted with Duns Scotus, 25; Leonine edition of his works, 36.
- THOMSON, discovers electrons, 105.
- Traditionalism, condemned by the Church, 13.
- Truth, its unity and immutability according to St. Thomas, 8.
- TURNER'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 244, 329; on Scholastic philosophy, 32.
- TYRRELL, on Scholasticism, 28.
- UBAGHS'S influence in Belgium, 215.
- UEBERWEG, on Scholastic philosophy, 32.
- Unity of God, 132.
- Universals, conceptualists on, 24; Hauréau on, 20; de Wulf on, 20; Albert the Great's solution of the problem of, 24.
- URRÁBURU'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 181 ff., 330; his strictly scholastic method, 37; on sense and intellect, 119; on immortality of the soul, 121.
- VACANT, 211, 330.
- VACHEROT, on act and potency, 49.
- VALLET, 205, 331.
- VALVERDE TÉLLEZ, 190-1, 331.
- VENTURA, 155.
- VÉRONNET, on ether, 103.
- VOLTAIRE, regarded as a Scholastic by Picavet, 2.
- WEBER, on Scholastic philosophy, 27.
- VAN WEDDINGEN, 216, 333.
- WERNER, 200, 334.
- WHETHAM, on ether, 103.
- Will, freedom of, 145 ff.
- WILLIAM OF CHAMPEAUX, connected with Medieval mysticism, 23.
- WOODBIDGE, on vital problem of metaphysics, 47.
- DE WULF'S contribution to neo-Scholasticism, 221-2, 335; his definition of Scholastic philosophy, 17; on problem of universals, 20; on historical studies, 38; on Scholastic system of ethics, 136.
- ZELLER, on Scholastic philosophy, 32.
- ZICLIARA, 164-5, 336.

VITA

The author of this dissertation, Joseph Louis Perrier, was born at La Garde Adhémar (France), on March 12, 1874. In 1890, he received his Elementary Teacher's diploma (Brevet élémentaire) at the Academy of Aix. Two years later (1892), the University of Montpellier conferred upon him the Higher Teacher's diploma (Brevet supérieur) and a Bachelor's degree (Baccalauréat de l'enseignement secondaire spécial). In 1904-1905, he studied at the College of St. Francis Xavier (New York City) under Fathers O'Brien, Shealy and Prendergast, S.J., and was given the degree of A.M. in 1905. From 1905 to 1908, he studied in Columbia University under Professors Woodbridge, Dewey, Fullerton, Miller, Montague and Adolphe Cohn. The degree of A.M. was conferred by Columbia University in 1906.

TO

202 Main Library

2

3

4

5

6

in print loans may be renewed by calling 642-3405

renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date

REC CIRC JAN 21 1986

FORM NO. DD6, 60m, 3/80

BERKELEY, CA 94720

GENERAL LIBRARY - U.C. BERKELEY



8000933836

B-
125

189823

Perrin

